ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΩΝ ΔΙΔΑΧΗ.

THE

DOCTRINE

OF

BAPTISMS:

OR, A

DISCOURSE

OF

Dipping and Sprinkling;

Wherein is shewed the Lawfulneſs of other Ways of *Baptization*, beſides that of a

TOTAL IMMERSION;

AND

Objections againſt it Answered.

LIBRARY UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY NEW YORK

By *WILLIAM WALKER*, B. D.
ſometimes of *Trinity* Colledge *Cambridge*.

In Sacramentis ſalutaribus neceſſitate *cogente*, & *Deo* indulgentiam *ſuam largiente*, totum *credentibus conferunt Divina* compendia. *D.* Cyprian. *l.* 4. *Ep.* 7.

Let us draw near with a true Heart, in full aſſurance of Faith, having our Hearts *ſprinkled* from an evil conſcience, and our Bodies *waſhed* with pure Water, *Heb.* 10. 23.

Imprimatur, *Guil. Jane*, Feb. 22. 1677.

LONDON,
Printed for *Robert Pawlet*, at the Sign of the *Bible* in *Chancery-Lane*, near *Fleetſtreet*, 1678.

TO THE

Moſt Reverend Father in God

WILLIAM SANCROFT

By Divine Providence

LORD *ARCH-BISHOP*

OF

CANTERBURY,

Primate of all *England* and Metropolitane,

WILLIAM WALKER

RECTOR of COLSTERWORTH

Wiſheth all the Happineſs of this Preſent, and of the Future State.

MY LORD,

HOw great a Happineſs it is to this weather-beaten Church to have a Perſon of ſo great Abilities, and known Integrity, advanced to that high Honour and Truſt of being its Prime Steerſman in theſe unſteady and tempeſtuous Times, is

eaſier by much for me to conceive, than to declare. Nevertheleſs I do humbly aſſume the boldneſs to expreſs the deep ſenſe I have of it, and the high joy I have conceived for it, by dedicating unto Your Graces Name the enſuing Treatiſe: in which I defend that Church, whereof You are conſtituted the Supreme Eccleſiaſtical Miniſter, againſt ſuch a ſort of Adverſaries, as ſtrike not only at its Wealth and Grandeur, but even at its very Life and Being, and moſt eſpecially in their management of that particular Controverſie, which is the Subject of theſe following Papers, whereby, whilſt they go about to unchriſten our Perſons, they endeavour to unchurch our Church: for how that can be a true Chriſtian Church, in which there is neither Magiſtrate, nor Miniſter, nor People, that have been baptized with a true Chriſtian Baptiſm, (and none have been ſo, in the opinion of the Anabaptiſts, that have not been totally dipped) I am yet to learn. And I humbly beg, that Your Grace will vouchſafe Your Patronage to this particular Treatiſe, becauſe of the weighty importance of this Controverſie, and of the indiſpenſable neceſſity of making good this Poſt againſt the inſulting Adverſary, and of clearing all difficulties about it, that ſo the unſetled Conſciences of well-meaning men, who modeſtly doubt, or are unfactiouſly diſſatisfied therein, and, as they ſoberly ſeek, ſo would gladly find, whereon they might ſafely, as well as finally ſettle, may at length have ſolid ground, whereon to build a clear ſatisfaction to themſelves, that they are already in a ſtate of true Chriſtianity, and live in a truly Chriſtian Community, and have no neceſ-

ſity

ſity in order thereunto, of turning Anabaptiſts, and being baptized over again; that ſo every Stone of Offence, and Stumbling-block of doubt being removed out of the way, the Diſſenters from the Church of England *on this account, may chearfully and conſcientiouſly return to union with it; which as it is my hearts wiſh, and ſouls deſire, ſo is it my principal aim, and main deſign in theſe Papers: or elſe may be known to all the World to continue perverſly and unconſcionably in their ſeparation from it; which God, in his infinite mercy to this Church, and Them, forbid. And now, as knowing that Your Graces concerns are both too many, and too weighty, to be diverted, or interrupted, with other mens little, and yet long impertinencies, I wiſh Your Grace much joy of, and the Church a long enjoyment of You in, that Honour, whereunto his Majeſty, to the great content of all his People, hath ſo worthily advanced You; and in all dutiful affection remain*

My Lord,

Colſterworth near *Grantham*, *May* 1. 1678.

Your Graces moſt Humble and moſt devoted Servant,

WILLIAM WALKER.

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

Courteous READER,

IN the midſt of Trouble by the death of my dear Wife, Sickneſs of my ſelf, and Diſſolution of my Family and School, by the Small pox, about the beginning of the Year 1677. came to me one Mr. *Pan* with a *Challenge* to a publick *Diſputation* with one Mr. *Grantham*, a Ring-leader, it ſeems, of the Sect of the *Baptiſts*, as they are pleaſed now to call themſelves, whom elder times uſed to call *Anabaptiſts*. This challenge I refuſed to accept of. That *Refuſal* was Trumpeted up and down among their Party, and by them among others, to the diſparagement both of my *Perſon*, and of the *Cauſe* I maintain. With the Refuſal, I ſent the *Reaſons* of it alſo, which they have not been ſo ingenuous as equally to diſperſe; I will therefore beg the Readers Favour, that I may acquaint him therewith; which done, I ſhall leave both him and all the world, to judge as they pleaſe of me and it. And this Publication of my *Reaſons* I make by the advice of my Prudent Friends; and I do it partly to give a ſtop to the boaſtings of that Party, and prevent prejudice to my Cauſe on that account, and partly to allay that Pruriency of mind to diſputation, which may be in ſome, by ſhewing them Reaſons why they ſhould decline

cline Diſputes, unleſs when they are as well *Authorized* to it, as *Enabled* for it. And but for this I could very contentedly have ſat down under all my diſparagements, being abundantly ſatisfied with that Approbation of my Refuſal, which I found it to have, in the judgment of Wiſe men. The Reaſons were theſe that follow, all in Subſtance, and much in Words.

Firſt, I alledged my want of a *Memory* neceſſary for ſuch a Purpoſe. He, I ſaid, that was to manage a Publick Diſputation, needed to be a man of a great Memory, able, not only to repeat Syllogiſms, but alſo to quote Chapter and Verſe of Scripture, and Book and Section of other Authors, to remember the Occaſions and Scopes of Diſcourſes incident, with their Contexts, Antecedents, and Conſequents. But I was ſo far from all this, that if any thing ſhould be quoted againſt me out of mine own Book, I could hardly be able to gainſay it, till I had ſeen, and read the place. And therefore as being utterly unfit in that reſpect for any ſuch undertaking, I refuſed it.

Secondly, I ſaid, He, that was to engage in a Publick Diſpute, ought to be a Perſon of great boldneſs and confidence. And 'tis true; for elſe, though otherwiſe ſufficiently learned and eloquent, he ſhall by ſome inſolencies in the words or carriage of a bold and confident Antagoniſt (or perhaps of ſome of the Company) be daſhed out of countenance, if not quite baffled, and ſilenced; however he ſhall be troubled, and diſturbed, if not utterly confounded, in his own reaſonings; he ſhall loſe many advantages by what he could ſpeak, for want of confidence to ſpeak them; and his *Cauſe* too ſhall ſuffer for his ſake, in the opinion of at leaſt one half of his Hearers, who will conclude the timidity of his *Perſon* to be the product of his own ſenſe of the weakneſs of his *Cauſe*. But I (as I ſaid) was a man of ſo much Modeſty and diffidence, that if I did but appear in any greater Audience, I was ordinarily ſtruck with ſuch a Conſternation, that I was hardly able to deliver any thing I had to ſay, unleſs I had my Notes before me to read, or caſt my eye,

upon at pleaſure. And having been all my life long uſed to privacy, and retirement, and never drawn forth into any ſuch publick contraſt, I could not think I could be able to keep courage and countenance, and manage my undertaking with that boldneſs and confidence, which was neceſſary on ſuch occaſion, and in the preſence of ſo vaſt a multitude, as would have been gathered together to hear us. And if my Memory was bad of it ſelf, that *Fear* would have made it worſe. And even the conſcience of a bad Memory was enough, even of it ſelf, to diffuſe a diffidence into me, had I been otherwiſe indued with a better ſtock of Confidence, than I dare boaſt my ſelf to have. And ſo, as utterly unfit on that account alſo to maintain a Publick Diſputation, I declined it.

Thirdly, I alledged my ſelf utterly unqualified for ſuch an undertaking, if not by reaſon of *Sorrow of Mind*, yet on account of *Infirmity of Body*. He, I ſaid, that was to manage a Publick Diſpute ought to be a man of a ſtrong Body, and ſound Lungs, able to ſpeak long, and loud, that the Auditors might underſtand what was ſaid, and eſpecially ſince the humour now was to give the Cauſe, not according to the *Soundneſs of the Reaſon*, but according to the *Loudneſs of the Voice* of the Diſputant. But I was a man far from this, being at preſent but in a *recovering condition* from two diſtempers, juſt got down out of my Chamber, not as yet got abroad, and at beſt ſubject to Infirmities enough, to procure me, from any man of Reaſon or Pity, a Writ of Eaſe from ſuch an endangering Engagement. Should I have appointed a day for Diſpute, I could not be ſure I ſhould be able to hold it, going many times well to bed, and being arreſted ere the morning with the Stone or the Gout. And what interpretation would have been made upon a faileur on ſuch occaſion, though the reaſon had been never ſo juſt; and how much it muſt have been turned to the diſparagement not of my *Perſon* only, but of my *Cauſe* too, let the Reader judge. And ſuppoſing it, that I had ſtood ſound in theſe reſpects, yet that I ſhould be able with a Cough of the Lungs, and a broken

broken Vein, to ſpeak ſo loud as to be heard by half the Company, and ſo long as till his *Eight Queſtions* were diſputed thorough, is not imaginable. And if nothing elſe, yet that neceſſary care that I ought to have of my own preſervation, for the ſake of my children, new made Orphans by the death of their Mother, had reaſon enough in it to diſſwade me from being ſo prodigal of my Life or Health, as, without greater Reaſon, and more Neceſſity for it, than any I yet ſaw, to throw away, or expoſe either unto hazard, in a brabling conteſt; and on that account alſo I would not admit of it.

Fourthly, ſuppoſing nothing of all this had been, yet the buſineſs it ſelf, I ſaid, was of a mighty concernment, not my private quarrel, but the *Churches Cauſe*; and that conſidering my own manifold deficiencies, I could not think my ſelf Champion enough for ſuch an Engagement. And therefore as being unwilling either that ſo great a weight ſhould lie on ſo weak a ſhoulder, or that the Churches Cauſe ſhould ſuffer by my inſufficiency to maintain it, I would not diſpute. It was excepted, I might take in others to my aſſiſtance, and ſo engage with an equal number on the other ſide. To this I replied, that I knew what I had to ſay my ſelf; but what another might ſay I could not tell. And therefore being unwilling to hazard ſo great a concern on ſuch an uncertainty, I would not engage, no not with the aſſiſtance of any other, in a Publick Diſpute. I added alſo that a plurality of Diſputants was many times a hindrance in the diſputation; whilſt one by an unſeaſonable interpoſition prevented another of, or put him by, his Argument, or diſturbed and confounded him in his Arguing. I ſaid further that I had *written* what I had to ſay in the Cauſe, and Mr. *Grantham*, if he pleaſed, might anſwer that; and then it might by others be judged on which ſide the greateſt probability of truth did lie. It was again excepted, that I might as well *diſpute*, as write. But I anſwered, Nay; for beſides my Perſonal indiſpoſitions rendring me unqualified for Diſputation, when I wrote I could at my beſt leaſure conſider what I did, and by the help of Books or Notes recover,

recover, at one time or other, what was ſlipt out of my memory; alſo I could offer what I had written to the Eyes of learned Perſons, and have their judgments thereon: but could not do ſo in an Oral Diſputation. It was laſtly urged that my Refuſal to diſpute would *reflect* upon me. But thereto I anſwered, that I would rather chuſe to ſuffer in my Credit for my Refuſing to diſpute, than that the Church ſhould ſuffer in her Cauſe by my ill diſputing.

Fifthly, Suppoſing my ſelf never ſo able to diſpute, yet ſtill I alledged, that I had no *warrantable Call* to engage in ſuch a Publick Diſputation. Had the King, or the Biſhop, or any of my Superiors *commanded* me to it, I muſt have obeyed, and would have done my beſt in it, not doubting but that God that gave me the Call, would alſo afford me his Aſſiſtance. But having no *warrantable Call* thereto, I would not *unwarrantably* engage therein. It was excepted, that I might eaſily obtain leave of the Biſhop, if I would deſire it. But I anſwered, that being neither perſonally fit for it, nor at all ambitious of it, I would not in the leaſt ſeek after it.

Sixthly, I alledged that I had ſeldom known any *great good* that came to the Church by Publick Diſputations. For the Diſputants honour and credit lying at ſtake, *Victory* was more often aimed at than *Truth*. And in order to the obtaining of that, all advantages were by each Antagoniſt againſt his Adverſary narrowly watcht and catcht at; all arts and ſtrategems made uſe of to elude and evade Arguments (eſpecially when they were likely to prove ſharp and pinching;) and particularly that *notorious one* of endeavouring by perverſe and intricating arguings, and croſs and involved anſwerings, if not alſo by ſome exaſperating words, or diſobliging actions, to put the Antagoniſt beſides his Reaſon, by putting him into Paſſion: ſo that ſeldom any Argument was driven to the head, or the Conference came to any good iſſue: but the Diſpute moſtly ended in impertinent ſquable and endleſs contradiction, to no advantage towards the eſtabliſhment of the truth, or edification of the Hearers:

Hearers: and therefore, were I never ſo able, I ſhould be moſt unwilling, to engage in ſuch a fruitleſs adventure.

Beſides, I asked, to whoſe *Umpirage* we ſhould ſtand, if we diſputed, as believing it vain to diſpute without an Umpire. It was anſwered the *Company* ſhould be Judges. I replied, that I was leaſt of all ſatisfied with that: in regard the Hearers, which would be ſure to be of different Parties, uſually judged as they were affected, and ran away, after all, with ſeveral ſtories of what was ſaid and done; and placed the Crown of Victory on the head of their own Combatant; the conſequent whereof was the filling of the Country with confuſed noiſes, and news of their triumphs, not at all tending to the good of the Church, but to the further unſetling of People in their minds and judgments, and to the diſpoſing of them ſo much the more to Schiſm and Faction. And upon this account alſo, had I been never ſo able, I was unwilling to diſpute. I added alſo, that neither I, nor any Miniſter of the Church of *England* could engage with any of their Party in a Publick Diſpute, but upon *mighty diſadvantage*. For *we*, though never ſo ignorant, muſt be looked upon as great Scholars, and *they*, though never ſo learned, muſt be looked upon as ignorant Men. And then what comes of it? If *we* get the better of them, it is no diſparagement to their Perſons, nor diſadvantage to their Cauſe: becauſe *we* are ſuppoſed to carry the day, not by the goodneſs of our Cauſe, but by the greatneſs of our Learning, or however by our cunning and ſophiſtry in diſputing. And, a great piece of matter will it be ſaid to be, for ſuch learned Univerſity Scholars, to be too hard for ſuch unlearned Country Men. But if *they* get the better of *us*, or be but able, though by meer wrangle, to hold us up, then a Song of Triumph is ſung, then both *our Perſons*, and *our Cauſe* ſuffers diſparagement thereby, but *theirs* is ſuperlatively magnified by all the Parties and Favourers of their Sect. And that Victory ſhall be ſolely imputed to the *ſtrength of their Cauſe*, which was only owed to the *weakneſs of their Adverſary*. And therefore to give them no

ſuch

ſuch matter for Triumph over the Cauſe I maintained, I would not ſo diſadvantagiouſly engage in the Diſpute whereto I was challenged.

And now having declared the Grounds of my Refuſal of that Diſpute, I leave my Self to the Cenſure of all, whether I did as became me, in refuſing it, or not.

Notwithſtanding I declared to Mr. *Pan* then, that as I had formerly held private Conferences with ſeveral Perſons of their way, naming ſome unto him, ſo if either Himſelf then, or at any other time after, or Mr. *Grantham*, or any other of his Party whatſoever, without excepting any, would come ſingly, and one to one hold diſcourſe with me, in a modeſt way, and a peaceable manner, in order to the ſatisfaction of his private doubts, he might freely come when he would; I would refuſe none.

But as that was then refuſed by Mr. *Pan*, ſaying, he came not upon that deſign, ſo neither He, nor any other of their Party hath ever been with me ſince upon any ſuch occaſion. And ſince I find ſo ill uſe made of what paſſed betwixt him and me then, I have cauſe to think it a mercy, that I have been troubled with no more of them; and for the future ſhall ſo think it. I mean the bold *Diſputers* of the Faction, and not any modeſt *doubters* of that way.

Having for my own, and others ſatisfaction made many reſearches into this *difficult Point*, and having at length ſetled upon, as I then thought, and ſtill hope they will prove to be, ſolid grounds of ſatisfaction, and finding this to be *one of the Queſtions*, whereabout Mr. *Grantham* challenged me to diſpute, and remembring what I had heard of his *Abilities* that way, I began with more earneſtneſs of deſire, and firmneſs of reſolution, to purſue my deſign. So that if I have done the Church any ſervice in this Treatiſe, that Challenge of Mr. *Granthams* is in a good meaſure to have the thanks for it: Perhaps elſe it had longer been in doing. And now, having through God's aſſiſtance brought it to an end, I have publiſhed it for the *Common good*; hoping it may in ſome meaſure be uſeful to inform the ignorant, re-

ſolve

ſolve the doubtful, and ſilence at leaſt, if not ſatisfie Gainſayers.

I need not, to invite you to the Reading of it, make any long harangue about the *weight* and *importance* of the ſubject of it, or its *concernment* to your ſelf. 'Tis in ſhort, no more, nor other, than this, whether you have been truly baptized, and ſo may go on with a ſatisfied conſcience to reckon your ſelf to be a Chriſtian, or whether your former Baptiſm, if not by a *total immerſion*, were not a meer nullity, and you conſequently of neceſſity to be by a new baptiſm, and that too by a *total* Dipping, initiated into a ſtate of Chriſtianity. If I have contributed any thing to your ſatisfaction in this ſo *highly*, and ſo *nearly* concerning an Inquiry, bleſs God that made me Inſtrumental thereunto. If I come ſhort of my aim therein, then pray to God to put it into the hearts of thoſe that guide the Helm of Church affairs, to preſs *ſome other* more able Perſon for that ſervice. And the rather ſhould both you and I deſire this, leſt, if we cannot prove our Baptiſm true, we be not able to prove our Chriſtianity good; and if we cannot make good our Chriſtianity, it be not hard for us to prove, either that there is ſuch a thing as a *Miniſtery* in the Church, or ſuch a thing as a *Church* in the Land, unleſs in the Community of *Anabaptiſts*. For a Church conſiſting of Magiſtrates, and Miniſters, and People, which are all unbaptized Perſons, (as all are by the *Anabaptiſts* ſo accounted, who were not, when baptized, *totally* dipped) is ſuch a Riddle, as may not very eaſily be reſolved. *Let the wiſe in heart conſider this.*

I have ſaid enough, if not too much, by way of *Preface*; and therefore I will not detain you any longer with a diſcourſe of my Phraſe, Style, and Manner of handling of this Subject, * but leave that to the judgment of your own candor and ingenuity, hoping that what is given you with the right hand, you will not take with the left. Farewell.

* Only note, that ſometimes I uſe *ſprinkling*, as a generical word, comprehending all the ways of baptizing different from *Dipping*.

A PRAYER.

O Lord God, who hast given me power, and will, leisure and opportunity, to begin, go on with, and finish this Treatise, I bless Thee for all the gracious furtherances, and favourable assistances vouchsafed unto me therein. And I do most humbly, and most earnestly beg of Thee to bless it to the Ends whereunto I have designed it, which are the Advancement of thy Glory, and the promoting of the Peace of this Church, by the Satisfaction of Doubters, and the Conviction of Opposers. Put, I beseech Thee, into the hearts of all that shall read it, a readiness to receive the Truth in Love. And second the reading of it with such Light and Evidence from thy Word and Spirit, that the Truths herein delivered may be convincingly discovered. If to Thy Foundation, which is ever Truth, I have through Ignorance, Inadvertency, or Misapprehension, added any thing that is Erroneous, O let that Error be made to appear, that no Other may be deceived thereby, though I have been so. And when that Error comes to be justly condemned; O let thy Servant be mercifully pardoned. Grant this for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

The *Author* hath lately put forth a *Defence* of the *Baptizing* of *Infants*, called, *A Modest Plea for Infants Baptism.*

THE

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

THE Text. Several ways of Baptizing. The Grounds of all, the same. Page 1

CHAP. II.

Several Acceptions of βαπτίζων, *and how 'tis taken here.* p.3

CHAP. III.

Βαπτίζω, *how rendred by Divines and Grammarians.* p.6

CHAP. IV.

Of the Primitive Verb βάπτω; *that it doth not signifie only to dip.* p.13

CHAP. V.

That βαπτίζω *doth not always signifie only to dip.* p.20

CHAP. VI.

Of βαπτισμὸς, *that it doth not always import a total immersion.* p.35

CHAP. VII.

Of the Hebrew טבל, *and the* Syriac ܨܒܥ : *and that they do not universally signifie a total immersion.* p.54

CHAP. VIII.

Βαπτίζω, *not restrained to a total immersion amongst* Christians, *by the practice of the* Jews. p.59

CHAP. IX.

The agreeableness of baptizing by aspersion or affusion unto the Nature of Baptism. p.64

CHAP. X.

Other ways of baptizing besides that of a total immersion *used in the Church, in all, or most Ages and Places of it* p.74

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Anſwers to Authorities produced to the contrary, by Mr. Danvers, *from divers* Grammarians, Divines *and* other Writers p.158

CHAP. XII.

Anſwers to Authorities produced by Mr. Danvers *from Commentators*, &c. p.195

CHAP. XIII.

Anſwers to more Authorities produced by Mr. Danvers, *from Hiſtorians, Caſuiſts, and other* Polemical, *as well as* Didactical *Writers* p.219

CHAP. XIV.

The Churches Grounds for admitting of Sprinkling, *in General* p.258

CHAP. XV.

The Churches particular Inducements to admit of Sprinkling p.265

CHAP. XVI.

The Inſtitution of Chriſt not violated by Sprinkling, *and the agreeableneſs of That; with the primary deſign of Baptiſm further manifeſted* p.276

CHAP. XVII.

A Concluſion by way of Paræneſis *to the* Dippers p.292

ERRATA.

PAge 9. Line 17. read *–ſing by waſhing.* p. 12. marg. l. 3. r. *urget.* p. 13. m. l. 6. r. *tingo.* p. 34. l. 27. r. *βαπτίσει.* p. 41. l. 29 dele *not.* ib. l. 36. r. *do underſtand.* p. 67. m. l. 4. r. *Chriſtus.* ib. l. 35. r. *Juvenc.* p. 77. m. l. 3. r. *baptizare.* p. 86. m. l. 15. r. *Where by.* p. 93. m. l. 7, 8. r. *ſeipſam.* p. 103. m. l. 4. r. *totum.* ib. l. 10, 11. r. *conſequuntur.* p. 105. l. 29. r. *away ſins.* p. 117. m. l. 6. r. *Neophyt.* p. 121. l. 11. r. *of, the.* p. 126. l. 33 r. *of any.* p. 163. l. 8. r. *it, like.* p. 231. l. 2. r. *that their.* p. 237. m. l. 7. r. *ergo.* p. 248. l. 14. r. *ſo when.* p. 262. l. 10. r. *then.* ib. l. 27. r. *about to confute.* p. 273. m. l. penult. r. *nudi.* p. 275. m. l. 7. for *Id.* r. *Voſſ.* p. 284. m. l. 18. for *ſacram*, r. *ſuorum.* p. 295. m. l. 1. r. *Num.* p. 297. m. l. 23. r. *admiſiſſe.*

ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΩΝ ΔΙΔΑΧΗ:

THE DOCTRINE of BAPTISMS:

OR,

A DISCOURSE OF

Dipping and Sprinkling, &c.

CHAP. I.

The Text. Several ways of Baptizing. The Grounds of all, the ſame.

Matth. 28. 19.

Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them---

§. 1. THeſe were the words of our ever Bleſſed Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt to his Apoſtles. The time when he ſpake them, was ſome while after his Reſurrection, and but a very little before his Aſcenſion. And ſo they are not his firſt Inſtitution of his Baptiſm; which was adminiſtred by his Apoſtles, and therefore inſtituted by himſelf, before his Paſſion. But they are an *Enlargement* of that Commiſſion,

Baptizantes.] *Non hîc inſtituit baptiſmum, liquet enim ex capite* Joan. 4. *diſcipulos Chriſti jam antè Baptizâſſe, quod non puto quiſquam abſque Chriſti dicet factum eſſe præcepto, multo minus alium illic & alium hîc eſſe baptiſmum,* Muſc. in Matth. 28. 19. Vid. P. Lombard. l. 4. Diſt. 3. part. 2. & Mod. Plea for Inf. Bapt. c. 30. Sect. 2.

which he had formerly given to his Apoſtles, to preach to the Jews, and baptize them, to an authorizing of them to preach to the Gentiles alſo, and to baptize them; and perhaps with ſome, *Improvement* of it in point of Form, End, or Uſe: whence ſome as well formerly as lately, have been apt to think them the firſt Inſtitution of Baptiſm, eſpecially as Chriſtian.

§. 2. That by his Apoſtles preaching and baptizing, in purſuance of their Commiſſion, both Jews and Gentiles were at firſt brought to be, and were made Diſciples unto Chriſt, I think is a thing on all hands concluded; as alſo what is meant by Preaching.

§. 3. But what is meant by Baptizing, or after what manner Baptiſm was, and is to be adminiſtred, is not ſo well agreed upon.

§. 4. Some are of opinion that it was, and ought to be performed by a total Immerſion, or Dipping of the whole Perſon into the Water; that this is the only lawful, and effectual way of baptizing, and conſequently of abſolute Neceſſity; and that all other ways are not only unlawful, but perfect nullities.

§. 5. But the opinion of others is, that it was, and may be performed otherwiſe than ſo; *viz.* either by Dipping of ſome Principal part of the Perſon (as the Head or Face, *&c.*) into the water; or elſe by Pouring or Sprinkling of water upon ſome Principal part of him; that though Immerſion be *a lawful* and an effectual way of baptizing, yet it is *not the only lawful* and effectual way of doing it, nor abſolutely neceſſary; but that the other uſual ways of baptizing are lawful alſo as well as it, and the baptiſm adminiſtred by them, to all intents and purpoſes as valid and effectual, as if performed by it.

Aliter pectus credentis abluitur, aliter mens hominis per fidei merita mundatur, D. Cypr. l. 4. Ep. 7.

§. 6. Immerſion, or Dipping, ſtands on three grounds, *viz.* the *Signification* of the word Βαπτίζω; the *Agreeableneſs* of Dipping with the *Nature* of Baptiſm; and the

the *Practice* of the Church to Dip when she baptized. Now if it can be shewn, that the other usual ways of baptizing are neither repugnant to the *Signification* of that word; nor to the *Nature* of the thing; nor to the *Practice* of the Church, but are agreeable unto all: then, I hope, it will appear, that they standing on the same grounds with Dipping, are also lawful as well as Dipping; and that baptism by dipping is not so necessary, as to nullifie the other ways of baptizing, or render them unlawful. And the declaring of this is the design of these Papers: and that declaration will be a competent exposition of our Saviours meaning in this his Commission, given to his Apostles to make all Nations Disciples, Βαπτίζοντες αὐτούς, baptizing them.

CHAP. II.

Several acceptions of Βαπτίζων, *and how 'tis taken here.*

§. 1. THe Method of this Discourse, as it is already laid down, obliges me to begin with the consideration of the Verb Βαπτίζω, whose Participle Βαπτίζοντος is here made use of by our Saviour. And as it stands in this Text it may deserve an enquiry in what acception, whether Proper or Tropical, it is to be taken: for be the proper acception of it what it will, if it be not here taken in that proper acception, no argument can hence be drawn to infer a necessity of dipping.

§ 2. That the word Βαπτίζω, *i. e.* to baptize, is not always used in Scripture according to its literal import, but sometimes in a Tropical sense, is I think out of question. But if any doubt the truth of this point, 'tis easily demonstrated; and an instance or two may suffice to do it.

§. 3. And that it is used sometimes in a *Metaphorical* sense is apparent by what the Author of the Acts of the Apostles reports our Saviour, after his Resurrection, to have promised to his Disciples, namely, that whereas *John* had *baptized with water, they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days after, Act.* 1.5. Where when our Saviour saith, *ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost*, no man that is right in his wits, will say he used the word baptize in its proper sense, but only in a Metaphorical one; as intimating thereby that within a short space they should be endued with the Holy Ghost, whose effusion on them in a larger measure, might seem to be a kind of baptism, the graces of it falling upon them, as the dew fell upon the *Israelites*, when they were baptized in the Cloud, 1 *Cor.* 10.2.

§. 4. So when in *Luke* 15.20. our Saviour saith of himself, *I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitned till it be accomplished!* he cannot be understood to speak of baptism in its proper notion. For with a proper baptism he had already long before been baptized by *John* in *Jordan*. His meaning then in so saying, was nothing else, but to express by a Metaphorical word, that *grievous afflictions*, those heavy sufferings of the Cross, were shortly to be endured by him, whereby he should be as it were overwhelmed, as a man is with waters, when he is baptized by dipping, or rather be bedewed all over with drops of bloud through his scourging, or at his bloudy sweating, as a man is bedewed with water, that is baptized by Sprinkling.

Sanguinis inquit proprii tinctione prius habeo perfundi. Bed. in Luc. Evang. c. 12. v. 50.

§. 5. But the word is not used in a Metaphorical sense only, but also in a Metonymical. And so one is said in Scripture to be baptized, who is imbued with, or instructed in the Doctrine of any Master, who initiates his Disciples with the Ceremony of Baptism. Hence *Paul* (*Act.* 19.3.) asks some Disciples found by him at *Ephesus*, who

who had ſaid, that *they had not ſo much as heard, whether there were any Holy Ghoſt, into what they had been baptized,* whereto they anſwered, *into Johns baptiſm.* The ſenſe of which words is, as if the Apoſtle had asked, with what Doctrine they had been inſtructed, and they had anſwered, that they had been inſtructed in that doctrine, which *John* taught. Whence, as it follows (*ver.* 4.) *Paul* ſaid, *John verily baptized with the Baptiſm of repentance, ſaying unto the people, that they ſhould believe on him, which ſhould come after him, that is, on Chriſt Jeſus.* Which is, as if it had been ſaid, that *John* had inſtructed the people in the doctrine of repentance, and of faith in Chriſt, who was to come after him. In this ſenſe S. *Mark* (c. 1. v. 4.) reports how *John did baptize in the wilderneſs, and preach the baptiſm of repentance for the remiſſion of ſins,* that is, inſtruct the people, who were to be baptized, in the doctrine of repentance. And in the ſame manner is *Apollos* by S. *Luke* reported (*Acts* 18. 25.) to have *diligently taught the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptiſm of John,* that is, being only inſtructed with that doctrine concerning Chriſt, wherewith *John* Baptiſt did imbue and ſeaſon his Diſciples.

§. 6. And there are that earneſtly contend, that the word Βαπτίζοντες in this Text, is to be taken, not in the proper, but in this Metonymical ſenſe. And aſſuredly there is *no mention* here (as there is in other places where the word is properly taken) *of water,* wherewith the Nations were to be baptized, but only of the Faith wherein they were to be inſtructed. He ſaith not Βαπτίζοντες αὐτὺς εἰς ὕδωρ, baptizing them in, or into water, but εἰς ὄνομα in, or into the name of the Trinity.

Vid. Chriſtian. Beckman. Exercitat. Theolog. 17. p. 257, &c.

§. 7. But in regard that way of interpreting would bring in a needleſs Tautologie into this ſo ſhort a Precept of our Saviours, *Go make all Nations diſciples, teaching them, and teaching them,* (and ſtill worſe, if μαθητεύσατε were to be rendred *teach,* viz. *teach, teaching, and teaching*;)

in regard I find not Βαπτίζω any where elſe in Scripture joyned with μαθητεύω or any the like word in the ſenſe of teaching; in regard that the Apoſtles of Chriſt did baptize with water, and there is extant in Scripture no other precept of Chriſt's touching baptizing therewith, whereon to found that practice, but this; and in regard the whole Catholick Church of Chriſt hath ever baptized with water, and hath interpreted this Text of ſuch baptizing, I will not for the gaining of any advantage to my Hypotheſis by any ſiniſter interpretation, recede from the Eccleſiaſtical way of interpreting, but ſhall freely grant, that the word Βαπτίζοντες is to be underſtood here in its proper notion; and yet hope nevertheleſs to evince, that there is no neceſſity from thence of ſo interpreting the word of a total immerſion, as to exclude all other ways of baptizing, as unlawful and null. And to that I will next addreſs my ſelf.

CHAP. III.

Βαπτίζω, *how rendred by Divines and Grammarians.*

§. 1. AND as it is confeſſed and acknowledged by ſome, and thoſe good Authors, that Βαπτίζω doth ſignifie that *ſpecial* way of applying water to a perſon, or thing, whereby *he*, or *it*, is immerged, totally dipped, or put under water; ſo it is declared and affirmed by others, both *Divines* and *Grammarians*, and thoſe of good note, and well skilled in the language of the *Greeks*, that the word Βαπτίζω, beſides its *ſpecial* way of ſignifying to *dip*, doth ſignifie alſo a more *general* way of applying water to a *perſon* or *thing*, whereby he, or it, is ſprinkled, rinſed, or any way waſhed: ſo as that a thing or perſon may be ſaid Βαπτίζεσθαι, which is any way waſhed, though not totally immerged, dipt, or put under water. §. 2.

§. 2. To begin with *Divines*. Learned *Piſcator* ſpeaks fully to the point, ſaying that the Verb Βαπτίζειν ſignifies, not only to be *dipped*, but alſo any other way to be *tinged*, *waſhed*, or *rinſed*. The like ſpeaks *Bucanus*, ſaying, that Βαπτίζω is (*i. e.* ſignifies) to *dip in*, to *intinge*, to *waſh*. And juſt ſo ſaith *Zanchy*, this word Βαπτίζω doth as well ſignifie to *die*, and *ſimply to waſh*, as to *immerge*, or *dip in*. And accordingly *Maldonat* ſaith, that with the *Greeks* Βαπτίζειν ſignifies to *dip*, to *waſh*, to *waſh oft*, and as *Tertullian* uſes to turn it, to *tinge*, *wet*, or *die*. *Bonaventure* ſaith, that *Baptizo* in Greek ſignifies as much as *lavo* in Latin. Whence (ſaith he) *Judith* went down into the vallie of *Bethulia*, *& baptizabat ſe*, *i. e.* and waſhed her ſelf, according to his intent, elſe his inſtance is no proof, *Judith* 12. 7. And though it be ἐβαπτίζετο in the greek, yet *Jun.* and *Trem.* render it, not as the vulgar Latin, *baptizabat ſe*, ſhe baptized, or dipped her ſelf, but *abluebat ſe*, *i. e.* (as *Tindal* tranſlates it alſo) ſhe *waſhed* her ſelf. And the greek not being ἐβαπτίζετο εἰς πηγὴν, but ἐπὶ πηγῆς, though the vulgar Latin render it *in fonte*, and *Tindal* in the *well*, yet it cannot ſignifie that ſhe dipped her ſelf, or was *dipped* by any other into the Fountain (the Greek Prepoſition ἐπὶ with a Genitive caſe not admitting that Conſtruction, ſo

Etſi enim mergendi ritum veteri Eccleſiæ obſervatum fuiſſe conſtat; tamen verbum Βαπτίζειν *non ſolum mergi ſed etiam quâvis aliâ ratione* tingi *aut* lavari, abluive *ſignificat.* Joh. Piſcat. Com. Loc. de Baptiſmo Aphoriſ. 1. pag. 157, 158. *Baptiſmus unde dicitur?* παρὰ τὸ βάπτειν, *quod eſt* mergere, tingere, madefacere, *& à conſequenti* lavare: *à quo* βαπτίζω *quod eſt* immergo, intingo, abluo, Bucan. loc. 47. 1. pag. 605. *Verbum autem hoc tam ſignificat* tingere, *& ſimpliciter* lavare, *quàm immergere.* Hier. Zanch. l. 1. *de cultu dei externo* c. 16. Tom. 4. col. 493. Βαπτίζειν *græcis aquâ* mergere, lavare, abluere, *& ut* Tertul. *ſolet vertere*, tinguere *ſignificat.* Maldonat. *in* Matth. 28. 19. *Notandum eſt quòd* Baptizare *in Græco tantum valet, quantum* lavare *in Latino, unde* Judith deſcendebat in vallem *Bethuliæ* & baptizabat ſeſe. Bonaventur. *in l. 4 ſent. diſt. 3. art. 1. qu. 1. Roſ. Neque verbum Græcum* Βαπτίζειν *tantùm ſignificat* mergi: *ſed quoquo modo* tingi. Pet. Martyr. in Rom. 10. fol. 141. *d.* Baptizare

far as I can find; nay, ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης *Joh.* 2. 1. is not *into the Sea*, nor *in the Sea*; but *at the Sea*, that is *by the Sea*, *ad mare*, as *Hierom* and *Beza* render it; *juxta*, as Dr. *Busbie*, beside, or nigh to it; and again ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης is *super mare*, *Matt.* 14. 25. so ἐπὶ τῷ θαλάσσαν *ib. v.* 26. so ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα *super aquas*, *ib. v.* 28, 29.) but that she *washed* herself *ad fontem*, as *Jun.* and *Trem.* render it, at or by the fountain. *Peter Martyr* saith that the Verb Βαπτίζω doth not signifie only to *dip*, but *any way* to *tinge*, and *wet*, or *die*. *Ferus* saith, *baptizare* is a Greek word, signifying to *tinge*, or to *immerge*. So again Dr. *Whitaker* saith, Βαπτίζειν signifies not only to *immerge*, but also to *tinge*. *William Vorrilong* saith, *Baptizo* in Greek is the same that *lavo* is in Latin, proving what he saith, as *Bonaventure* before had done, from what is said of *Judith*, c. 12.

Græcum verbum est. significat autem tingere, *vel* immergere. Fer. *in* Matth. 28. p. 603. Βαπτίζειν *non* immergere *tantùm significat, sed &* tingere, *Dr.* Whitaker, Prælect. de Sacram. Baptismi qu. 1. c. 2. p. 217. Baptizo *enim in Græco, idem est quod* lavo *in Latino. Unde de* Judith, c. 12. *scribitur*, Descendebat in vallem Bethuliæ, & baptizabat se, *i. e. lavabat*, Guil. Vorrilong. in lib. 4. sent. dist. 3. edit. Venet. An. 1502.

§. 3. I go on to *Grammarians*. And *John Scapula* (an Author never the worse for being common, but rather so much the better) gives to this Verb, as the *special* signification to *dip*, so the *general* also to *wash*. Nor do his Abbreviators *Schrevelius* and *Robertson* say otherwise: but having given to βάπτω (whence is derived Βαπτίζω) both the *special* signification of *dipping*, and the *general* of *washing*, they say of Βαπτίζω, that it signifies the same. *Pasor*, who writes particularly of the words of the New Testament, walks in the same steps

Βαπτίζω, mergo, immergo, *item* abluo, lavo, Scap. Βάπτω intingo, mergo, lavo. *Hinc* Βαπτίζω, *idem*, Schrev. Robertson. Βαπτίζω immergo, abluo, baptizo, *Pasor.* Βαπτίζω mergo *seu* immergo. Βαπτίζω, abluo, lavo Steph. *Dicta autem est Vox Baptismus à* Βάπτω tingo, *ac* Βαπτίζω immergo. *Porro ter Metalepsin significat* abluo, lavo. Flac. Illyric. clav. Scripturæ. Βαπτίζειν *propriè notat*

ſteps with the former, giving to this Verb, not only the *ſpecial* ſignification of *dipping*, but the *general* alſo of *waſhing*. And if theſe ſeem little Authors, then *Henricus Stephanus*, a man every way great, and particularly for the goodneſs as well as bigneſs of his *Theſaurus*, ſaith the ſame that they do: firſt giving to Βαπτίζω the *ſpecial* import of *dipping* or *immerging*, and then the *general* of *cleanſing* or *waſhing*. To theſe we may add *Flacius Illyricus*, giving to the word the ſame ſignifications that they do. And Mr. *Leigh*, who ſaith the word *Baptize*, *ſignifies ſuch a kind of waſhing as is by plunging, yet it is taken more largely for any kind of waſhing, rinſing* or *cleanſing*, by *waſhing even where there is no dipping at all*: quoting for it, Dr. *Featly*, and *Voſſius*. Yet we may add further *Martinius*, who ſaith, Βαπτίζω ſignifies to *die*, and to *waſh*: and alſo *Suidas*, who gives it not only the particular ſignifications of *dipping*, and *dying*, but alſo the *general* of *wetting*, *waſhing*, *purging* and *cleanſing*.

mergere: *ſed quia fere aliquid mergi ac tingi ſolet, ut lavetur, ac abluatur, hic pro* lavare *uſurpatur*. Voſſ. in Theſ. ap. Leigh. Cri. Sac. Βαπτίζω *eſt* mergo, tingo, lavo, Martin. Βαπτίζω, mergo, immergo, tingo, intingo, madefacio, lavo, abluo, purgo, mundo, baptizo, *Suidas*.

§. 4. Now if there be any weight in theſe Authors words, when they affirm that the word Βαπτίζω doth ſignifie in *general* to *waſh* (and why may *we* not as well believe *them* ſaying ſo, as *others* when they ſay it ſignifies in particular to dip?) then the Party that is any way waſhed in Baptiſm, may be truly ſaid to be baptized, though he be not dipped. And ſo, as far as their Authority is able to carry it out, the Point is proved therefrom.

§. 5. And yet, before I leave them, give me leave to make one Remark upon their different renderings of the word. I find nine Latin words uſed to expreſs the import of it, *viz. mergo, immergo, tingo, intingo, lavo, abluo, madefacio, purgo, mundo*, beſides one made of it ſelf, *baptizo*. Are all theſe words perfectly Synonymous, exactly and adequately ſignifying the ſame thing? or are they not? If the

the former, why ſo many of them uſed, not only ſcatteringly by all ſeverally, but even together, by one ſingly, viz. *Suidas?* If the latter (which will appear to be true by a conſultation both with Authors and Lexicographers) then they all do not ſignifie a total immerſion. And that's the thing that does our buſineſs. For if βαπτίζω ſignifie any thing leſs than a total immerſion, or any thing elſe but that, then a Baptiſm may be, where one is not totally immerſed.

§. 6. I will not now ſtand upon it to examine the exact differences of all theſe words one from another: but ſhall only take notice of *tingo*, or as ſome read it, of *tinguo*; becauſe *Martinius*, having ſaid of βαπτίζω, that in Chriſtianity it ſignifies a religious and Chriſtian action, ſaith alſo, that when the Latines expreſs the force of it, *viz.* as ſo uſed, they put the word *tingere* for it: which is apparent by inſtances both from *Tertullian*, and St. *Cyprian*, and St. *Auguſtin* too. Now if *tingo* be not a term convertible with *immergo*, then there will be a baptizing, without a total dipping. And that thoſe cannot be terms convertible, betwixt which there is not an identity of ſignification, nor thoſe the ſame betwixt which there is any difference of acception, is evident to common reaſon. Now that there is a difference between *tingo* and *immergo*, I ſhall appeal to that ſo famous a Profeſſor in his time, *viz.* Dr. *Whitaker*, who in ſaying, that of old the Adult, who were baptized, were not lightly *tincti aut aſperſi*, but *immerſi*, makes a clear difference betwixt *tinction* (whatever that means) and immerſion: ſo as that the one

Nam nec ſemel, ſed ter, ad ſingula nomina in ſingulas perſonas tinguimur. Tert. *adv. Praxeam. Lex enim tinguendi impoſita eſt, & forma præſcripta. Id. de Bapt. p.* 262. *Non baptizabat, quia non ipſe tingebat. D.* Aug. *Tract.* 15. *in Evang. Joh. Tom.* 9. *Col.* 132. *B. Qui in errorem ſeductus eſt, & foris tinctus. D.* Cyprian, *l.* 1. *Ep.* 12. *Adulteræ aquæ contagione tinctus. D.* Cypr. *ad Jubaian. Dr.* Whitak. *Præl. de Sacram. Bapt. q.* 1. *c.* 2. *p.* 216. *Tinctione contenti, quam ſufficere putârunt, immerſionem non deſiderabant. Id. ib.* Bap-

was

was not the other. Which yet he more clearly delivers in saying, that, though so it had been, as he had said before, yet there had been another custom in some places, and among some persons, where contenting themselves with *tinction*, which they thought sufficient, they desired not *immersion*. And again βαπτίζειν signifies not only to *immerge* or *dip into*, but also to *tinge* or *wet*. If then *tingo*, as *Martinius* saith, do express the force of βαπτίζω in the Christian use of it, and *tingo*, as Dr. *Whitaker* intimates, be not the same with *immergo*; then where there may be said to be a *tinction*, there may be said to be a Baptization, though there be not a total immersion.

βάπτιζειν *non* immergere *tantùm significat, sed &* tingere. *Id. ib.* 217.

§. 7. And according to this distinction made by the Doctor betwixt these Verbs, in the Canon of the Provincial Council of *Colen*, held in the Year of Christ, 1536. under *Herman* Arch-bishop thereof, it is said, *The Infant is thrice either immerged, or tinged with the Water of Baptism*; that is, it is either dipped into, sprinkled (or some other way than by immersion wetted) with the baptismal water. So also the no less pious than learned Dr. *Holdsworth* saith, in some Churches, the baptism by *dipping* is in use only, in others that by *sprinkling*, and a light *tinging*: and admits the difference of *tinction* and *mersion*, whether once or thrice, not to be of the essence of the Institution of Baptism. So that Dr. *Whitaker* is not alone in this distinction, neither the first, nor the last that used it.

Ter verò infans vel immergitur, vel tingitur aquâ baptismatis. Can. Concil. Provinc. Colon. subHerm. celebrati, 1536. Habere institutorem suum Christum Baptismum omnes norunt, & habet tamen aliquam administratio ejus diversitatem. Nonnullis enim in Ecclesiis Baptismus per immersionem solus est in usu; aliis per aspersionem levémque tinctionem — Dr. Rich. Holdsworth *Lectio. 22. p. 687. Utcunque enim tinctionis & mersionis, sive trinæ sive unius, differentia non sit de essentia Institutionis Baptismi, at — Id. ib.* See also the Testim. of *Ferus, Sect. 2.* and of *Bede, c. 2. S. 4.*

§. 8. And

§. 8. And in further Confirmation ſtill of what that Doctor ſaith of the different uſe of *tingo* from *immergo*, which yet it alſo ſometimes ſignifieth, it may not be amiſs to give an inſtance or two of ſuch uſe of it. Such is that of Martial, Ep. l. 2. *Frange toros, pete vina, roſas cape, tingere nardo.* For Men do not uſe to dip their Heads in Spikenard, but to pour, or rather have it poured on their Heads. Whence we read in *Hor. Epod.* 13. *Achamenia perfunde nardo.* And an inſtance we have of it in the Goſpel, *Mark* 14. 3. where a Woman having an Alabaſter Box of Ointment of Spikenard poured it on our Saviour's Head. And ſuch is that of *Cicero, l.* 3. *de Nat. Deor.* where he tells of *Deianira's* giving to *Herculei tunicam ſanguine Centauri tinctam, i. e.* a Coat, not all dipped into, but tinged, wetted, ſmeared, and conſequently dyed with the blood of the Centaur; that muſt be (becauſe it could be no otherwiſe) but as it ran from his Wound, which *Hercules* gave him when he ſhot at him. And accordingly the learned Lexicographer calls it *veſtem ſanguine perfuſam*, and *veſtem ſanguine imbutam*, and *veſtem ſanguine infectam*. And ſo by *Seneca* it is called *Tabe Neſſea illita palla*; and by *Ovid. Illita Neſſæo texta veneno.* By all, a wetting, imbuing, infecting is intended, by none a total immerſion.

Quis multâ gracilis te puer in roſâ Perfuſum liquidis unget odoribus? Hor. Od. 1. 5.

Nec enim Herculi nocere Deianira voluit, cùm ei tunicam ſanguine tinctam dedit. Cic. 3. *de N. Deor.*

Vide Stephani Lexic. Hiſtoricum ex Edit. Nicol. Lloydii, in Voc. Deianira, & Neſſus. *Illita Neſſæo miſi tibi texta veneno. Ovid. Ep.* 9. *ver.* 163.

§. 9. Nay, even the compound Verb *intingo*, we find uſed in the Tranſlation of the *Syriac* Verſion of *Dan.* 4. 25, 32. to expreſs a wetting with the dew of Heaven, which cannot be by a total dipping into it. Yea and *Pagnin* from *Kimchi* tells us, that Intin-

Rore cæli intingeris. Te rore cæli intingendum. Intinctio eſt quum

Intinction is when any thing toucheth a thing that is moiſt, either in part, or in whole. And when *Quintilian* (as *Trebellius* quotes him) ſaith of one that was writing, that he did *calamum intingere*, dip in his Penn, ſure his meaning was not, that he dipt in all his Penn into the Ink, but only the nib of it. Now by this more ſtrong confirmation of the difference between *immergo* and *tingo* is the concluſion ſtill the more ſtrongly confirmed, *viz.* that there may be a baptizing without a total dipping; and even where there is but a wetting, whether by affuſion, or aſperſion.

aliquid rem humidam contingit vel ex parte, vel totam. Pagnin. voc. טבל. *Treb. Pol. Promptuarium. Vox. Intinge.*

CHAP. IV.

Of the Primitive Verb Βάπτω; *that it doth not ſignifie only to dip.*

§ 1. BUT that I may not ſeem to erect ſo weighty a ſuperſtructure on ſuch a ſlender foundation, as the names and credits of a few *Grammarians* or *Divines*, I will proceed towards the conſideration of the *word* it ſelf. And to make my conſideration of it the more complete and full, I will not only view it in its ſelf, but in the word βάπτω, from whence it is derived, and in the word Βαπτισμὸς, which is derived from it.

§. 2. And to begin at the Fountain head, the Primitive Verb βάπτω; of this Verb it is apparent by *Lexicographers*, and other *Authors*, that it doth not always ſignifie *total immerſion* or *dipping*, but ſometimes ſomething leſs than ſo, and even in a manner, *all waſhing*. Thence in *Scapula* we have βάπτω rendred, not only by *mergo*, *immergo*, to dip, but alſo by *lavo* to waſh. The ſame we have

again

Explic. Catech. pars 2. q. 69.

Βάπτω autem non tantum immergo, ſed & aſpergo ſignificat. Keck. *Syſt. Theol. l. 3. c. 8. p. 452.*

again in *Schrevelius*. And accordingly *Zech. Urſinus* ſaith βαπτίζω is derived from βάπτω *mergo, tingo, abluo, aſpergo*, to dip, die, waſh, ſprinkle. And ſo *Keckerman* ſaith, that βάπτω ſignifies not only to *dip*, but alſo to *ſprinkle*.

§. 3. But, waving their Authorities, we may judge of the import of the ſimple Verb βάπτω, by the uſe of its compound ἐμβάπτω. Our Saviour ſaith, (*Matth.* 26. 23.) *He that dippeth his hand with me in the diſh, the ſame ſhall betray me.* The original, for *he that dippeth*, is ὁ ἐμβάψας. That is the Participle of the Verb ἐμβάπτω. It is not imaginable, that any of our Saviour's Diſciples, as mean Perſons as they were, ſhould be ſo ill bred, as at Table, and in his Preſence too, to *dip his whole hand* in the Diſh. It cannot be thought any of them would do more than (it were ſcarce good breeding to do ſo much as) with a finger or two and a thumb to take ſome part out of it. And yet of him, that did put but ſome little part of his hand, or rather fingers into the diſh, our Saviour ſaith, ὁ ἐμβάψας, he that *dippeth his hand*. A clear inſtance, this, that the compound Verb ἐμβάπτω doth not neceſſarily enforce a *total immerſion* of that thing whereto it is applied. And can we think there is more in the ſimple Verb, than in the compound, and ſo compounded as this is, with the Prepoſition εἰς ſignifying *into*? This were againſt all analogy of ſpeaking. It may therefore hence be concluded, that the Verb βάπτω may be applied to a thing, which yet is not *totally immerſed* into that, wherein it is ſaid to be *dipped*.

§. 4. So that I ſhall not ſtand upon what is ordered in *Levit.* 14. for the cleanſing of a Leper, and his Houſe, namely to *take two birds alive, and firſt to kill one of them, and then to dip the live bird with cedar wood, ſcarlet, and hyſſop in the blood of the bird that was killed.* The word uſed here by the LXX. for dip is βάπτω. And yet it is not imaginable, how one whole live bird, with other things, ſhould

should be *wholly immersed* into the blood of another of but the same bigness with it.

§. 5. Perhaps it may be answered that the *dipping* was not into the blood alone, but mixt with running water contained within that earthen Vessel in which the Bird was commanded to be killed.

§. 6. I reply, this is not written. O, but 'tis probable. Yes: but so 'tis probable also, though not written, that *Infants* in the Primitive times were *baptized*, and that both they, and other weak persons, unable to abide a *total dipping*, were baptized by but a *partial mersation* into, or by a lighter *consperſion* with water. Let them yield to what is probable, or not contend for what is but probable. If we must stand strictly to what is written, then a living bird must be dipped in the blood of a killed bird: that could not be but by a *smearing* of it with it, or a *partial mersation* into it. And so βάπτω will signifie somewhat less than to dip all over. If we must not stand strictly to what is written, then let them not exact from us a Scripture expressly saying that *Infants were baptized*; or that any were any otherwise baptized than by being *wholly dipped*. But this by the by.

§. 7. *Favorinus*, who glosses βάπτωσι by ἐκπλύνει (as *Suidas* also doth) they *rinse* or *swill*, as when one washes nets or clothes (which sure would be but an odd manner of dipping, if used in baptizing) yet gives an instance of an use of the word, which cannot agree to this sense. 'Tis this, τὰ χείλη σε βέβαπται τῷ τῶν ῥόδων αἵματι, which doth not signifie thy lips have been *dipped*, that is, *swilled* and *rinsed* in, or *plunged* into the blood of roses; but, have been *died* or *coloured* with it, that is, are of a rosie colour, as red as roses. So that βάπτω here signifies not to *dip*, but to *die*. And though some things are *dipped* to be *died*; yet, *dipping* and *dying* are not terms convertible; not all things, that are *dyed*, are *dipped*: And to go no farther for an instance than the *painting* Females cheeks, I believe many of them are *dyed* with a delicate, fresh,

freſh, roſie complexion, which yet are never *dipped*, when they are ſo dy'd; they are *not dipped* into the complexion, but the *complexion laid* on them.

§. 8. But if any think to come off from this inſtance with ſaying, the ſpeech is but Metaphorical (though even ſo there muſt be a reſemblance between the things compared, or elſe there can be no Metaphor) yet there is an inſtance of this uſe of the word in the *Septuagint*, which cannot be ſo evaded, nor any other way that I can foreſee. It is ſaid of *Nebuchadnezzar* (*Dan.* 4. 33.) *that he was driven from men, and did eat graſs as oxen, and his bodie was wet with the dew of heaven.* So we, and ſo *Tindal* renders it. Now there the word for *was wet* is ἐβάφη. But that cannot poſſibly ſignifie, that he was *dipped* into the dew of heaven, any more than what he could be by lying down upon the dewie graſs, which no man will call an *immerſion*; none will ſay of a man that lies him ſo down, that he *dips* himſelf into the *dew*, or is *dipped* into it, but that he *wets himſelf*, or is *wetted* with it. Or if any ſhould, yet ſtill will that Notion very well agree at leaſt with their way of *baptizing*, who *dip*, though but *lightly*, the Face in water, when they *baptize*. Nor, that I know, will ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου ἐβάφη, bear any ſuch conſtruction. If dipping into the dew had been meant, it would in all probability have been, εἰς τὴν δρόσον, or, ἐν τῇ δρόσῳ, not ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου. I find not ἀπὸ uſed for εἰς. Nor doth any Verſion, that I can meet withal, ſo render it. *Montanus*'s Interlin. Verſion is *de rore cœlorum corpus ejus tingebatur*; and ſo the *Syriac*, *& de rore cœli tinctus eſt*, *i. e.* His body was *wet*, or he was wetted by, or with the dew of heaven. And the Vulgar Latin Bible agreeing with the Particular Latin Tranſlation of the Septuagint, renders it, *rore* [*de rore*] *cœli corpus ejus infectum erat*, his body was dy'd, or ſtained with the dew of heaven. And the *Arabic* of all, methinks, moſt properly,

Vid. Septuag. Levit. 4. 6. *Num.* 19. 18. 1 *Sam.* 14. 27. *Deut.* 33. 24. *Ruth* 2. 14. *Pſal.* 68. 23. 2 *King.* 8. 15.

perly, *perfusum fuit*, that is, was all to sprinkled, or wetted, or all *to shed upon* with dew. No dipping then in the case. And yet the word is ἐβάφη from βάπτω to dip, which clearly shews that word to signifie something other, more than, and besides *dipping*; even a *wetting*, and such a wetting as one is wetted withal by the *falling* of dew upon him, (which none, I think, will say is improperly expressed by *sprinkling*;) and so to be very agreeable with that wetting in Baptism, which is done by sprinkling the party Baptized.

§. 9. In *Rev.* 19. 13. I meet with ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι. This, *Ours* and *Tindals* Translation render *a Vesture dipt in bloud.* Under correction, I conceive it ought to have been rendred, not *dipt in*, but *dyed with bloud.*

§. 10. For first the Construction of the words so requires it. Had it been said εἰς αἷμα, I should not at all have disputed it, nor much if it had been ἐν αἵματι, because of such construction I find some example, though yet ἐν with a Dative Case sometimes signifies no more than a Dative Case without ἐν, and does so sometimes, when it hath βαπτίζω set with it, as we shall see afterwards. But of this Verb's signifying to dip into, with a mere Dative Case without ἐν, I find no example, and therefore I conclude that αἵματι here doth not signifie that, into which the Vesture was dipped, but *wherewith it was dy'd:* and that *dying*, not *dipping* is the import of the Verb in this place, and the construction is like that of the Septuagint, *Gen.* 37. 31. ἐμόλυναν τὸν χιτῶνα τῷ αἵματι, whereby was designed nothing more but their staining or besmearing of the Coat with bloud, much after the manner as *Nessus* did the Coat which he gave to *Deianira*; or like that newly mentioned from *Favorinus*, τὰ κείλη σου βέβαπται τῷ τῶν ῥόδων αἵματι, a place far enough from importing any thing of an *immersion.*

§. 11. Secondly, besides the construction of the words, the nature of the thing is against its interpretation by dip-

ping. *Garments dipt in blood?* to what end? for what use? who wears any such? Dipt in *Scarlet*, or dipt in *Purple*, they are for Kings, and Emperors, and persons of greatest eminency for place, and honour; but in *blood*, for no bodies wearing that I know of. But *Garments dy'd with blood* are as ordinary as battels. *Isai.* 9. 5. And not only the Conquereds, but the Conquerors. A memorable instance whereof is that of *Leopoldus Duke of Austria*, who fought so long at the taking of *Ptolemais*, till his Coat Armour was all dy'd in blood save his Belt (as one saith) or rather (as another hath it) the place covered with his Belt. In memory whereof that Family hath ever since born for their Arms a *Fesse Argent* in a *Field Gules*. And in allusion to such staining of Garments with the blood of slain enemies sprinkled upon them as befals conquering Warriers in their battels, is this place interpreted of our Saviour, whose garment is by way of Prophecie said to be stained with blood, to signifie (according to Mr. *Brightman*) the great slaughter he should make of his enemies; and (according to *Lyranus*) of the *Saracens* in particular; of whom so infinite a number was slain at the taking of *Jerusalem*, that (as *Gotfridus Viterbiensis* tells us) in *Solomons* Porch the blood of the slain was up to the knees of the horses. And the time of the so great execution done by Christ on his enemies, the Prophet *Isaiah* (as Mr. *Brightman* notes) seems to have an eye upon in his Prophecie, *ch.* 63. *v.* 1, 2, 3. (which is set in the Margin of our Text to signifie some reference that the

Cambd. Rem. p. 299. *Fuller* Holy War. l. 3. c. 8.

Tunc Christus hac specie se visendum præbebit indutum cruento sago & toto redundante sanguine hostium. Brightman in Apocal. 19. 13.

Veste aspersa, sc. Saracenorum ab eo occisorum, Lyra in loc.

Hostes ibidem comprehensi tantâ sunt occisione prostrati, ut in porticu Solomonis *sanguis occisorum usque ad nostrorum equorum genua perveniret,* Gotfr. Viterb. Chron. part. 17.

Quod tempus videtur Haias *spectare, inquiens, Quis est hic?* &c. *Optimo jure Christus aspersus*

the one place hath to the other) *Who is this that cometh from* Edom, *with died garments from* Bozra? *this that is glorious in his apparel: travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat? I have troden the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury, and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment.* But whether the reference of this Prophecie be to that Victory of the Christians over the Heathens, or rather (as *Scultetus* thinks, who entitles his Sermon on this Text and the Context, *Triumphus Dei habitu cruentato ex acie redeuntis*) to the return of the Jews from the *Babylonish* Captivity, to encourage them whereunto against the dreaded power of their enemies, the Prophet represents God their Leader, under the type of a Warrior triumphing over his enemies, and trampling them under his feet, as in the time of Vintage one treads and tramples grapes in the Wine-press, and staining his Garments with the sprinklings of their blood, after the manner as their garments are dy'd and stained that tread Wine-presses, still there is nothing of *dipping* in the case, but only of *dying*; and of such *dying* as is done by *sprinkling*.

tunc conspicitur cruore casorum inimicorum, Bright. in Apoc. 19. 13.

Edom *ruficundum*, Bozra *vero vindemiam significat.* -- *Ergo* venire ab Edom *est rubco vestitu incedere*, & venire tinctis vestibus de Bozra, *est habere vestimenta musto respersa.* Torcular calcavi, *i. e. uvas in torculari*: & *quidem* in furore, *hoc est magno cum impetu* & solus. *Atque hinc vestes hostium sanguine respersas gero. Nec enim secus illos compressi, atque ii qui mustum expressuri uvas conculcant*, Scultet. in loc.

§ 12. And therefore Thirdly, all Interpreters, that I as yet have met withal, except the two forenamed Translations, render βεβαμμένον by words importing *dying*, or *sprinkling*. *Ar. Montan.* hath for it *vestimentum tinctum sanguine*, a vesture dy'd with blood; and to the same

ſenſe *Beza* hath *Veſte tinctâ ſanguine*, and ſo the *Arabic* Verſion too. The *Vulg. Lat.* hath *veſte aſperſâ ſanguine*, a veſture ſprinkled with blood; and ſo the *Æthiopic* Verſion alſo. The *Syriac* hath *Veſte conſperſâ ſanguine*, a veſture all to beſprinkled with blood. All import ſuch a *dying* as was done, not by *dipping*, but by *ſprinkling*. And ſo here is a clear inſtance of this Verb's being uſed, where nothing of *immerſion* was intended.

§. 13. And of its being uſed to ſignifie *leſs* than a *total dipping*, I ſhall add one inſtance beyond exception, from that Collection of Sentences containing the Primitives of the Greek Tongue formerly done, and now added to *Schrevelius*'s and *Robertſon*'s Lexicons, in whoſe 19*th*. Chapter, I find this ſentence, Βάπτει μὲν ἀσκὸν, ὕδωρ δὲ ὑγρὸν οὐ δύει ποτέ· He indeed dippeth a bottle, but it never goes under the moiſt water: If it go *not under* the water, there is then no total immerſion: and yet that dipping which it hath is expreſſed by βάπτω. A plain proof that βάπτω doth not always ſignifie a total dipping. And ſo βαπτίζω hath ſomething elſe beſides a total immerſion in βάπτω the root of it.

CHAP. V.

That Βαπτίζω *doth not always ſignifie only to dip.*

§. 1. FRom βάπτω the Primitive, I proceed to βαπτίζω, derived from it. In *Luke* 11. 37, 38. a *Phariſee*, by whom our Saviour had been invited to dinner, is ſaid to have marvelled, when he ſaw him ſit down to meat, and had not firſt *waſhed*. The Greek word here rendred waſhed is ἐβαπτίσθη, the very ſame word by which our Saviour's baptiſm is expreſſed (*Mark* 1. 9.) where it is ſaid ἐβαπτίσθη, *he was baptized of* John *in* Jordan. A plain inſtance this, that by the word βαπτίζεσθαι is not always

always to be understood a *total immersion* of that whereto it is applied: and that a person may be said βαπτίζεσθαι, to be baptizedit, who yet is not *totally dipped*, but only (whether by *mersation*, or *affusion*) in part washed. And accordingly *Beza*, in his rendring of the Text, makes the Pharisees wonder at our Saviour to be, not that, (as the *Vulg. Lat.* renders, *non baptizatus esset*) he had not been dipped, but that *non ablutus esset*, he had not been washed, or as we render it, *had not washed.*

§. 2. But perhaps the *custom* of the Jews (and however among the Pharisees) was before dinner to wash themselves by a *total immersion*, or dipping of themselves. And that our Saviour had not done so, was the Pharisees wonder. And then the word here will signifie a total immersion. Not so, whatever some may think, or say in the case, Neither the Vulgar Jews, nor the nicer Pharisees had any such custom. They washed their hands indeed before meat by dipping them in to the hand-wrist, or by holding them up, that the water poured on them might run down to the hand-wrist: and that was all that was done, even by the Pharisees, before the eating of a common dinner. And for that, as dipping the hands, or pouring water on them, had made our Saviour fit enough, so dipping of his whole body, had he done it, had not made him more fit. Not then our Saviours not dipping his whole body, but his not washing his hands at all, neither by *mersation*, nor *affusion*, was the Pharisees wonder. And accordingly *Grotius* saith ἐβαπτίσθη here is as much as ἐνίψατο χεῖρας, he had washed his hands. And so *Beza* saith, that here it means the same that λούεσθαι & χερνίπτειν doth, whereof the one signifies in general to *wash*, the other in particular to *wash the hands*. And so still, βαπτίζεσθαι will not necessarily always signifie a *total immersion*, but some times in a more general way, a *washing*; and he may be said βαπτίζεσθαι, whose hands only are washed, and that

Vid Pocock *Porta Mosis, Not. in c. 9. p. 396, 397, 398.*

whether by putting them into the water, or by pouring water upon them. And if upon the hands but being waſhed, and that either by merſation or affuſion, a Man may be ſaid *Baptizari*, to be baptized, then as well may he be ſaid to be ſo, when (as it is now the uſe in *baptizing*) his but *head* or *face* is *dipped* into the water, or hath *water poured* upon it.

§. 3. And yet is not this the only inſtance that is produced in this caſe. There is another (in *Mark* 7. 2, 3, 4.) propoſed and urged by learned Perſons. I will repreſent it in its due ſtrengths, and advantages, and ſo leave it to be conſidered of by ſuch as are concerned in this debate. The words are, *And when they ſaw ſome of his Diſciples eat bread with defiled (that is to ſay with unwaſhen) hands, they found fault. For the Phariſees and all the Jews, except they waſh their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the Elders. And when they come from the market, except they waſh, they eat not.* The eating here ſpoken of is to be underſtood of common food: for it is ſaid *they eat not*, that is not at all, not ſo much as ordinary and common food, except they waſh. And the ſpeech here is not only of the ſuperſtitious Phariſees, but of the generality of the People, all the Jews: and ſure they did not all, and always feed on ſacred viands. Now what is here ſaid of their waſhing before that food? This, that they eat it not, except they waſh their hands πυγμῇ, that, I conceive, is, (ſomewhat otherwiſe than it is ordinarily rendered) up *to the hand-wriſt*, or joyning of the hand to the arm. And this if they did, either by *affuſion* of water upon their hands, ſo held that the water might run down ſo far, or elſe by *immerſing* them ſo far into the water, this was all was required of them to render them ſufficiently clean for eating of an ordinary meal. And there was no ſuch thing required of them, or uſed by them, as wholly to *immerſe themſelves* in water, in order to the fitting of themſelves for the eating of ſuch a meal. And what pollution had made them unfit for ſuch a meal without a total dipping of

of themſelves, had made them unfit for any more ſacred meal that day until the evening. And yet this waſhing, which was but of the hands, and might be indifferently performed either way, by *affuſion* or *immerſion*, is applied unto the perſons, and ſpoken of them in the verb βαπτιζεσθαι; for ſo run the words in Ver. 4. And when they come from the Market, ἐαν μὴ βαπτισωνται, (or as *Hen. Steph.* has it in his *Concord. Grac.* βαπτιζωνται) if *they waſh not*, or *be not waſhed*; for the ſame Verb, in the ſame Voice, and in the ſame Tenſe, is applied unto St. *Paul* (*Act.* 22. 16.) *Paſſively*, and ought to be ſo; as appears by comparing it with *Act.* 9. 18. and ſo 'tis to the Iſraelites, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. And though *Beza* be poſitive for that Verb's ſignifying primarily and properly *mergo* to dip, and but conſequentially *lavo* to waſh, yet here he renders it, not according to the primary and ſpecial ſignification of the Verb, *niſi merſati ſint*, unleſs they be dipped, but according to the ſecondary and general import of it, *niſi loti fuerint*, except they be waſhed: and ſo *Paſor* alſo. So that of whom it may be ſaid, that he is in any part (for inſtance in his hands) waſhed, whether by *affuſion*, or *merſation* (and eſpecially, if the latter be uſed) of him it may be ſaid that he is βαπτιζομενος, *baptizatus* (as the *Vulg. Latine* here renders the word) baptized. And ſo our *Infants* not being *totally immerſed*, but only in *part waſhed*, whether by *dipping* or *ſprinkling*, hinders not, but that, when that ſacred action is performed upon them, they may be ſaid βαπτιζεσθαι to *be baptized*.

§. 4. It may be anſwered, that βαπτισωνται here refers not to the *whole Perſons* of the Jews, as if always, when they came from the market, they did βαπτιζεσθαι, that is wholly immerſe themſelves, but to their *Hands* only: and that the meaning is, that whereas if the Jews kept at home, and did not go to the Market, they needed only to waſh their hands by *Affuſion* of water, but if they did go from home, and to the market, then they were to waſh their hands by *Immerſion*, as if, as it is ſaid before, ἐαν

μὴ νίψωνται χεῖρας, *except they waſh their hands*, namely by affuſion, ſo it had been ſaid here, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται τὰς χεῖρας, *except they waſh their hands, by immerſion*; the word χεῖρας, *hands* being to be underſtood in the latter Text, as it is expreſſed in the former: and ſo from the word's being here applied to no more but a part, which was *wholly immerſed*, no argument can be drawn to prove, that the whole may be ſaid to be immerſed, when the *immerſion* is but of a part; and that ſo the *Infants* being dipped but in part, cannot be called their Baptiſm, much leſs the ſprinkling or pouring of a little water on them.

§. 5. But to this it may be replied, that the waſhing here muſt be underſtood according to the * Tradition of the Elders: but there was no ſuch Tradition of the Elders, as that all that came from the Market ſhould either immerſe *themſelves*, or but ſo much as their *hands*, wholly, before they eat bread. That they ſhould *waſh* before eating was the Tradition: but the manner how they ſhould waſh, whether by *affuſion*, or *immerſion*, was left at liberty, ſo they did it either way, πυγμῇ, up to the wriſt. And though, becauſe the defilements of their hands were like to be greater in the Market, than at home, therefore the nicer ſort of them, eſpecially the Phariſees, did rather chuſe to waſh by *immerſion*, than by *affuſion*, as looking upon that as the higher degree of purification; yet they did not all; and few always waſht that way. Nor were they obliged to it by any Tradition of the Elders. And ye may obſerve, that holding the Tradition of the Elders, is ſet with νίψωνται, not with βαπτίσωνται. And yet they are the ſame Perſons, which are ſpoken of, when βαπτίσωνται is uſed, that are ſpoken of, when νίψωνται is uſed, the Phariſees and all the Jews. So that the waſhing implied in βαπτίσωνται, muſt be ſuch as was uſed, not only by the Phariſees, but all the Jews too, and that as holding the Tradition of the Elders: which (as has been ſaid) was no more than to waſh their hands up

* S. Matt. 15. 2. Παραδόσιν— ὅταν γὰρ νίπτωνται τὰς χεῖρας, &c.

up to the wriſt; and for the performance of which ſo much water as was contained in a meaſure called by them *Rebiit*, (which held about the quantity of *an Egge* and *a half*) was enough. So that it is plain that βαπτισωνται deſigns as well thoſe that waſhed by *affuſion*, as by *merſation*. And if it did not ſo, then *John* the ſon of *Goodgodah*, (who always uſed to dip his hands) and thoſe few others, that choſe to eat even common meat with that care of pollution, which they were to eat holy meat withal, had not obſerved the Tradition of the Elders, but muſt have by the others been condemned (like the Diſciples here) for eating κοιναῖς, *with defiled*, becauſe ἀνιπτοις χερσὶν with *unwaſhed hands*, though they had not eaten ἀβαπτίστοις χερσὶν with *undipped* hands, but had uſed *baptization* before their eating. And ſo then there is no neceſſity of interpreting βαπτίζεσθαι always of the ſtrict ſingular way of *immerſion*, but it may be uſed, when yet the *waſhing* is performed by but an *affuſion*: and ſo our *Infants* and others may be ſaid to be *baptized*, though not *totally immerſed*, or but *ſprinkled*.

§. 6. And for the ſetting of βαπτίζωνται after ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, that deſigns only thus much, that whereas thoſe that had waſhed in the morning for all day, keeping themſelves pure from defilement by polluting actions and occaſions, needed not to waſh any more before meat, they that went to the market, becauſe of the almoſt impoſſibility that there was to avoid defilements there, were at their coming home to repeat their waſhing before they did eat, though they had waſhed before: which waſhing was by no Tradition of neceſſity to be by *immerſion*, but might be performed by *affuſion*, as was ſaid before. And thus much for this inſtance.

§. 7. I paſs to another, *viz.* 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2. Where the Apoſtle beſpeaking his Jewiſh Brethren ſaith, *all our Fathers were under the cloud, and all paſſed thorough the ſea, and*

Cui ritui [*ſc. adſperſioni*] *quoque favet baptiſmus in nube & mari, de quo* Paulus 1 Cor. 10. agit. Walæus, Sy-

were

nopſ. Pur. Theolog. Diſp. 44. Theſ. 19. p. 606.

were all baptized into Moſes, *in the cloud, and in the Sea.* A baptizing we have here, that's plain; for they *were all baptized,* (and doubly too for fear of failing) *in the cloud and in the Sea.* But how were they baptized in the Sea? (to begin with that firſt) by being all *totally immerſed* into it? by being *dipped* all over head and ears into the water of it? That muſt be, if *baptized* according to the notion our Anabaptiſts have of *Baptiſm.* But, no ſuch matter. For, 'tis ſaid, *Exod.* 14. 21, 22. *the Lord cauſed the Sea to go back by a ſtrong Eaſt wind all that night, and made the ſea dry land, and the waters were divided: and the children of* Iſrael *went into the midſt of the Sea upon the dry ground, and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left.* So then, no *immerſion* of them into the Sea: no one of them had ſo much as a foot dipped into the water of it. And yet a *baptiſm in the ſea*: they were all *baptized,* and *baptized* in it. There may then be a baptizing without a total, yea or a partial immerſion of the party into that thing, wherein he is ſaid to be baptized. And ſo βαπτίζω will not neceſſarily always ſignifie either a total, or a partial immerſion.

Vid. Chriſtian. Beckman. *Exercit. Theolog.* 17. p. 251.

§. 8. But if not *dipped into the Sea,* when baptized in it; much leſs were they *dipped into the cloud,* when baptized in that. Men walking on dry ground, and yet dipped into a cloud? who diſcerns not the incongruity of it? Had they been dropt from heaven to earth, much of that might have been by the way. But as, and where, they they were, it could not be. And yet they were *baptized in the cloud.* Plain again then it is, that there may be a *baptiſm,* without a total, or partial immerſion of the party baptized into that wherein he is ſaid to be baptized; and conſequently βαπτίζω will not always neceſſarily ſignifie *immerſion.* And ſo our *Infants,* or others are, (and may be ſaid to be) truly baptized, though they are no more

more dipped into the waters, than the *Iſraelites* were into *the clouds* or into *the Sea*, when they were *baptized* in both.

§. 9. But how were they baptized in the cloud, and in the Sea? Why, by being *bedewed* with the *ſprinklings* of the cloud whileſt they walked thorough the Sea. And ſince *Cyril* of *Alexand.* * reſolves the cloud to be a figure of baptiſm, who can tell but that the two ways of baptizing, *viz.* of *dipping* and *ſprinkling*, might be typified by the two ways of baptizing *in the cloud*, and *in the ſea*? the way of *ſprinkling* by the bedewings of the cloud, falling in drops upon them; and the way of dipping by their going ſo into the Sea, as that, to ſuch as were on land, they might ſeem covered with it. For it is expreſly ſaid, *ver.* 6. ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, *theſe things were our examples*, or *figures*, litterally *types*, repreſentations made then in that Church, of things that ſhould be now in our Church.

Maris illius aquis capitibus ipſis tranſeuntium altius extantibus, obruti ac ſepulti quodammodo poterant videri, & emergere, ac reſurgere denuo cum ad litus objectum evaſiſſent — Pluviâ ergo copiosâ cùm perfunderetur populus ille univerſus, ſicut ſubter nubem exiſtiſſe omnes, ita nube baptizari omnes, commodè ſatis perbibentur, Gataker. Adverſ. c. 4. p. 30.

* *Non enim fieri aliter poterat, ut macula animis peccantium aſperſa aſpergeretur, niſi ſancto baptiſmo, cujus figuram nubem eſſe ſtatuimus.* D. Cyril. Alex. in Heſa. l. 2. c. 19. Tom. 1. col. 296.

§. 10. But be that as it will; the Apoſtle ſaith, the *Iſraelites were all baptized in the cloud, and in the ſea*: and yet none of them were dipped in either. No neceſſity then of an immerſion to make a baptiſm; or that βαπτίζω muſt always ſignifie to dip.

§. 11. And if an immerſion were neceſſary to make a baptiſm, how ſhall we underſtand it, that the Apoſtles of our Saviour were baptized with the *Holy Ghoſt*, as our Saviour promiſed they ſhould be? *Act.* 1. 5. Nay and with *fire* too, as St. *John* Baptiſt foretold (*Matth.* 3 11. and *Luke* 3. 16,) and was fulfilled (*Acts* 2. 3, 4.) What analogy

analogie is there between the *deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* upon the Apoſtles and *Baptiſm*, if Baptiſm muſt ſignifie nothing but a total *immerſion*? Sure the Apoſtles were not dipt, nor plunged into the *Holy Ghoſt*, that they might be ſaid to be baptized with it. No ſuch thing is ſaid of them. But they were *filled with the Holy Ghoſt*. Yes, but that holds no proportion with baptizing men by *immerſion* into water. If the water be any thing the fuller for the perſons baptized, ſo it is: but the perſon baptized are not filled with the water; they are put into the water, not the water into them. No reſemblance then betwixt *baptizing by immerſion*, and the *deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt* on the Apoſtles, that they from that ſhould be ſaid to be baptized with it.

§. 12. How then may they be ſaid to be baptized with it? Or what reſemblance is there betwixt that deſcent and any other way of baptizing, that from thence they may be ſaid to be baptized with it? There is a great reſemblance between baptizing by *aſperſion* or *effuſion* of water on the parties baptized, and the *deſcending* of the *Holy Ghoſt*. For as the water, that is ſprinkled, or poured on the parties baptized, falls uſually from above upon them: ſo did the Holy Ghoſt fall from above on the Apoſtles. And accordingly this coming of his from above upon them is called *effuſion*, *Act.* 2. 33. where S. *Peter* ſpeaking to the multitude concerning this action, ſaith, Chriſt, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promiſe of the *Holy Ghoſt*, (ἐξέχεε, *effudit*) hath *ſhed forth*, poured out *this which ye now ſee and hear*. And this according to a prophecie long ſpoken before by the Prophet *Joel*, and recited newly (*in ver.* 16,17.)

Ab alterâ verò notione, quâ βαπτίζειν *abluere ſignificat, tranſfertur ad Donationem* Spiritus Sancti; *nempe quoniam hic, ut animam imbuat & abluat,* aquæ inſtar, *in eam* effunditur: *prout loquitur SS.* Joel 2. 28. *& exinde S.* Petrus, Act. 2. 17. *item S.* Paulus, Tit. 3. 6. *ſervavit nos per* Lavacrum *Regenerationis, & Renovationem* Spiritus ſancti *quem* effudit *in nos* copioſe, Voſſ. de Bapt. Diſp. 1. p. 344.

16,17.) which was, that it ſhould come to paſs in the laſt days, that God *would pour out his Spirit upon all fleſh.* Nor is it only called an *effuſion*, but alſo a *falling* of it upon them. For when St. *Peter* reported to the Brethren in *Judea*, what had befallen *Cornelius* and his company at *Cæſarea*, and particularly the *Holy Ghoſts* being communicated unto thoſe *Gentiles*, as well as to themſelves who were *Jews*, (which communication is alſo called *a powring out of* the gift of the *Holy Ghoſt* upon them, *Acts* 15. 45.) he ſaith that as he began to ſpeak to them, the *Holy Ghoſt* (ἐπέπεσε) *fell on them*, as it had done on themſelves at the beginning, *Acts* 11. 15. Now what can more fitly anſwer to this, than *baptizing* by way of *effuſion*, or pouring out of water on the baptized, whether out of the hand, or other veſſel? So that there muſt be no reſemblance betwixt the *Holy Ghoſt* falling on the Apoſtles and *Baptiſm*, (and then why is his *falling* on them called *a baptizing* of them?) or elſe a *baptiſm* may be without an *immerſion*.

§. 13. And the like to what is ſaid of their being *baptized* with the *Holy Ghoſt*, may be ſaid of their being *baptized with fire*. The fire wherewith they were *baptized* came from above, and ſat upon them: they were neither dipt into any fire below them, nor ſat in it. So clear an evidence this, in my poor thoughts, that there needs nothing more to evince it, that the verb βαπτίζω, (eſpecially as it ſelf is baptized, and taken in from being a *Heathen* to become a *Chriſtian* word) may ſignifie to *baptize*, as well where there is but an *effuſion* or an *affuſion* of water on the party baptized, as where there is an *immerſion* of him into the water.

§. 14. And yet the word, even in its *Heathen uſe*, does not always ſignifie a *total immerſion* of that Perſon or Thing, whereto it is applied. For a Perſon firſt, we have an inſtance in *Porphyrie*, who tells us of a river in *India*, into and through which if an innocent perſon went, he was taken but up to the knees; but if an offender went

Βαπτίσαντας ἀνέσεσθαι τινα λίμνην ἔτι ἐν γοῦν παρ' Ἰνδοῖς δοκιμασθεὶς λεγομένην, τὸ βάθος δ' ἔστιν ἄχρι ἐπὶ γονάτων φαινῆς

ὕτως ἐν εἰς ἀυλλω ἐμβάν, ὅταν καλυγρόμενος ἐμβῇ ἀναμάρτητος μὲν ὤν, ἀδύνατος δὲ χαλάσαι ἄχει τῶν γονάτων ἔχων τὸ ὕδωρ, ἁμαρτῶν δὲ ὀλίγον γε βαπτίζεται μέχει κεφαλῆς. *Porphyr. de Styge*, p. 282. cited by Mr. *Whitbie* in his λόγος τῆς πίστεως, p. 40.

See *Sydenham*'s Christian Exercitation on Inf. Baptism, ch. 15. p. 132.

went into it, by that time he had gone a little way, βαπτίζεται μέχρι κεφαλῆς, he is baptized up to the head. Here we have such an immersion as denominates a Person βαπτίζεσθαι baptized; and yet is that immersion, not total, but only partial, μέχρι κεφαλῆς, up to, but not over the head. Then for a Thing: This (as Mr. *Sydenham* observes) appears from that delivered by the Oracle, Ἀσκὸς, βαπτίζῃ, δῦναι δέ τοι ἀδύνατον ἔστι. Where if δῦναι signifie to *plunge* or put wholly under water, as it does, then βαπτίζῃ must signifie less, as it also does, no more than is competible to a blown bladder, or bag, or bottle of leather, whose swimming in the top of the water cannot be called an immersion (at least not total) into it. And yet to signifie such a kind of scarce partial mersation is βαπτίζομαι here used. Baptize or wash him, *utris instar* as a bottle in the water, but do not drown him, or utterly plunge him; so Mr. *Sydenham* englishes it.

§. 15. And accordingly in St. *Chrysostom*, to express a total submersion we find καλαδύεσθαι added to βαπτίζεσθαι. Τὸ δὲ βαπτίζεσθαι (saith he) ἐν καλαδύεσθαι, εἶτα ἀναγεύειν, τῆς εἰς ὕδωρ καλαβάσεως ἐστι σύμβολον καὶ τῆς ἀνόδου. Where if βαπτίζεσθαι did import a total submersion under the water, it had been needless to have added καλαδύεσθαι, a Verb signifying the very same thing to it. And therefore in reason, as καλαδύεσθαι signifies a total submersion, so βαπτίζεσθαι should signifie at most but a partial mersation in this place.

Nam mergi & aquam subire, & hinc remeare, descensûs ad inferos symbolum est, & hinc reversionis; so one renders it. *Baptizari enim & demergi, deinde remeare & emergere est symbolum seu signum descensûs ad inferos, & ex eo ascensûs.* So another. But still with both βαπτίζεσθαι is less than καταδύεσθαι; with neither, *aquam subire*, or *demergi*, to be totally immersed.

§. 16. And

§. 16. And that καλαδύεσθαι does signifie a total immersion, is plain by that of S. *Athanasius*, where he uses that word to signifie the whole of what was done in baptism by way of immersion. Τὸ δὲ καλαδύσαι τὸ παιδίον ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ τρίτον καὶ ἀναδύσαι, &c. For our *thrice dipping* of the Infant into the water, and bringing him out again, signifies the Death of Christ, and his Resurrection after three Days. *qu.* 94. *de Interpr. Parab. Script.*

§. 17. If any should think to evade the force of this argument by making such a distinction, as if βαπτίζεσθαι did signifie to put the person wholly under the water, and καλαδύεσθαι to sink him, so put, further down unto the bottom. I must return, first that it cannot be proved, that ever there was any such custom in baptizing. Secondly for Infants, so great was the danger of their drowning by that means, that they would never do it. And thirdly that, for elder Persons, they were already at the bottom of the water before their baptism with the lower parts of their body, and wanted nothing, but the putting of their heads, or upper parts of their body under it by the Priest also. And so it remains that βαπτίζεσθαι there doth not signifie a total submersion under the water.

§. 18. But it is argued from the signification of ἀβάπτιστος a compounded derivative from βαπτίζομαι, that βαπτίζομαι signifies to be totally dipped; because a *Cork* swimming in the water is by *Pindar*, and a *Ship* floating on the Sea is by *Plutarch* called ἀβάπτιστος, which yet they could not be, if less than a total immersion were signified by βαπτίζεσθαι.

§. 19. To which I answer first, that though it might be unanswerably proved, by this, or any other Medium, that βαπτίζεσθαι did in *Heathen Authors* signifie nothing less than a total immersion, yet it will not follow that it must in *Christian Authors*, (whether the Scriptures, or other Writers) be always interpreted in exactness according to that signification. For the significations of words are to be widened, or straitned, according to the dimensions

sions of the things they are to signifie. And nothing is more ordinary than to find words familiar in Christianity (both in the Scriptures and Christian Authors) used in a sense somewhat remote from the signification of the same words in their Primitive use among *Heathens*. *Sacramentum* an Ecclesiastical Latin word, and Ἐκκλησία a Scriptural Greek word may serve for instances.

§. 20. The first signified at first a *Caution* put into the hands of the Pontifie by Parties going to Law, whereby they were obliged to make good their Plea, or lose their mony. Afterward it was made use of to signifie a *souldiers Oath*, whereby he was obliged to be true to his General. If then it must signifie still the same in the Christian Church, that it did in the Heathen Roman State, and nothing more, nor any thing less than that, we shall have much ado to make the word fit the things that are called by it. For then all that are *baptized*, or receive the *Lords Supper*, must be persons going to Law, or Souldiers, and they must put in *money*, and *swear* when they receive Baptism, or the Lords Supper. But what money is put in by either? what Oath is taken by either, on either account? From the Title of *Sacrament* given to those Ceremonies we argue an obligation equivalent to a Caution, or Oath, lying in the Receivers: but how to make it good from the Scriptures, or the nature of the Sacraments, that there is any such obligation in a real and literal sense lying on the party as that word in its Heathen institution and use originally signified, is not so very clear.

Ἐκκλησία συῳδὸς, συναγωγὴ, πανήγυεις, Hesych.

§. 21. The second signified at first literally an Assembly of the people of *Athens* called together to consider and debate of the concerns of that Republick. But in the Scriptural use of it, sometimes it signifies only that company of Professors of the Christian Faith, which belong to one * *Family*, with such as are admitted

* Rom. 16. 5. 1 Cor. 16. 19. Col. 14. 15. Philem. 2.

mitted to joyn with them in the worship of God. Sometimes it signifies a collection of all the several Congregations of Christians that are in one * great *City*. Sometimes a Collection of all Christians dispersed throughout the * whole *world*. But all these, and more notions, in which the Scriptures use that word, are far remote from that *Heathenish* import of it. And the same may be said of other words, *viz.* ἐπίσκοπος, πρεσβύτερος, ἱερεὺς, κῆρυξ, so of διαθήκη, δικαιοσύνη, τελειόω, μυστήριον, &c. which all have other significations in the Scriptures, than they are found to have amongst Heathen Authors. And we shall make mad work in the Church, and with the Scriptures too, if we shall go about to lop and prune, to frame and square the things signified by them in the Church, and in the Scriptures, to what they signifie in *Pagan* writers.

* *Act.* 8. 1. & 13. 1. & 18. 22. & 20. 17. 2 *Thess.* 1. 1. *Col.* 4. 16. *Rev.* 3. 14. & 2. 8, 12, 18. & 3. 1, 7.

* *Matth.* 16. 18. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Gal.* 1. 13. *Eph.* 1. 22. *Phil.* 3. 6. *Col.* 1. 18. *Heb.* 12. 23.

§. 22. And thus, though βαπτίζω might signifie originally to dip all over amongst the *Heathens*, yet being taken in by the *Christians* to signifie that Ceremony of washing with water, whereby members were admitted into actual Communion with the Church of Christ, it is, in their speakings and writings, to be understood in such a latitude, as may extend to all manner of admissions of any by that Ceremony into the Church, however differing in circumstances of acting, which have been used and allowed of in it. And for as much as it may undeniably be made good, that persons have anciently, as well as of late, had their *baptismal admission* into the Church by other ways than a *total dipping* into water, and the Church hath never by any Ecclesiastick censure expressed her disallowance of those ways, therefore the word βαπτίζω is to be extended to the signifying of every usual and allowed way of admission by that Ceremony into the Church, though not by a total dipping. Inasmuch as the design of the

Church is one and the same in every way, whatever it be, of administring baptism, whether by a total immersion, or partial mersation, and whether by affusion, or aspersion, *viz.* to signifie that the blood of Christ hath that virtue to cleanse the *Soul* from the *guilt* of sin; and the grace of the Spirit that virtue to cleanse it from the *filth* of sin, which water hath to cleanse the *body* from its pollutions and defilements; and that the party baptized, if no obstacle be put in on his part, is really cleansed from the spots and stains of his *soul*, when application is made of that cleansing water to his *body*; and so both fitted for, and actually received into, Communion with the Holy Catholick Church, which is the body of Christ, and consequently into union with Christ himself, who is the Head of that Church.

§. 23. Secondly, I answer, that βαπτίζω being declared (as hath been shewed) to signifie not only an *immersion* or *dipping*, but also a *tinction* or *wetting*, though a Ship, or a Cork floting on the water, may be said to be ἀβάπτιστος in the first sense, yet it cannot be said of it, that it is ἀδάπτιστος in the second sense. For *wetted*, and *tinged*, and *dipped* (if ye will) it is in part, even as the soals of the Priests feet were in *Jordan*, though it be not *plunged* or *immersed* all over. And though in some respect it be said to be ἀδάπτιστος, being not dipped all over, yet in some respect it cannot be said so to be, as being dipped in part. And so our Infants cannot be truly said to be ἀδάπτιστοι, not baptized at all, though they be not wholly immersed at their baptism; since they are in part baptized, *viz.* tinged, or wetted, whether by a partial mersation or dipping of them into water, or by an affusion or sprinkling of water upon them.

§. 24. But as I noted before, if by these or any other instances, it might be invincibly proved, that βαπτίζω did in the *Heathen* Notion of it signifie strictly a total immersion, and no instance or evidence could be given of its ever signifying any other thing among them, yet unless it could

be

be as invincibly proved, that no *Eccleſiaſtical* word did ever ſignifie any thing other in the Scriptures, than juſt what it ſignified in Heathen Authors, which is impoſſible to be made good, no Argument can be drawn from the *Heatheniſh* import of the word to preſcribe to the *Chriſtian* uſe of it. Now that leſs than a total immerſion hath in the judgment of the Catholick Church been accounted a Baptiſm, (which could not have been, if by that word it had deſigned nothing leſs than a total immerſion,) is as clear as the Sun, from its practice to baptize other ways, which will be ſhewed in the proceſs of this Diſcourſe. And to the Interpretation of Scriptural words referring unto Practice, I know not how we may be more ſurely guided, than by the judgment of the Catholick Church, declared in the genuine *Records*, and confirmed by undoubted *Inſtances* of the Practice of it.

According to Chriſt's inſtitution, the Scripture, where 'tis plain, ſhould guide the *Church*. And the Church, where there is doubt or difficulty, ſhould expound the Scripture. A. B. *Laud, Ep. Ded.* to K. *Ch.* I.

CHAP. VI.

Of Βαπτισμὸς, *that it doth not always import a total immerſion.*

§. 1. WE have viewed βαπτίζω in it ſelf, as well as in βάπτω, the root from whence it is derived: let us now view it in βαπτισμὸς, the branch that is derived from it.

§. 2. And if we conſult *Lexicographers* about it, they tell us that beſides the particular ſignification it hath in the Church, to note the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*, it ſignifies alſo more generally a *waſhing*, as well as ſpecially a *dipping*. Thence *Schrevelius* and *Paſor* render it by *lotio*, a waſhing; and the former hath nothing elſe but *that* for it.

By *Scapula* 'tis rendred, *merſio, lotio, ablutio, ipſe immergendi, item lavandi ſeu abluendi actus*; dipping, waſhing, cleanſing, the act it ſelf of dipping, waſhing, or cleanſing. *Stephanus* renders βαπτισμὸς and βάπτισμα by *merſio, lotio, ablutio*, dipping, waſhing, cleanſing, underſtanding thereby the act it ſelf of dipping, and alſo of waſhing or cleanſing. Mr. *Leigh* in his *Critic. Sacr.* from *Danæus* (*Iſag. Chriſt.* l. 5. *de Sacram.* c. 21.) tells us, that though βαπτισμὸς be derived from βαπτίζεσθαι ſignifying to *immerſe*, and more eſpecially into water, yet becauſe thoſe that come out of the water do appear waſhed, and white, and clean, therefore βαπτισμὸς is commonly put in Scripture, *pro lotione & mundatione*, for waſhing and cleanſing. And *Alſted* ſaith the ſame in his *Lexic. Theolog.* almoſt to a word, c. 12. p. 310, 311. *Coulon* in his *Lexic. Homeric.* having rendred βάπτω by *mergo, tingo, abluo*, ſaith, thence is derived βαπτίζω and βαπτισμὸς, which he there defines to be a Sacred myſtery of the entrance into Chriſtianity adminiſtred in the Church *merſione, ablutione, & aſperſione ſeu tinctione*, by dipping, waſhing, ſprinkling, or wetting. *Flacius Illyricus* in his *Clavis Scripturæ* ſaith, that *Baptiſmus propriè intinctionem ſignificat*, properly ſignifieth intinction, a word uſed by *Tertullian*, and that by a Metalepſis it hath the ſignification of *ablution*, and *lotion*. And that that word doth not ſignifie always a *total dipping* in order unto *dying*; but a *wetting* without ſuch a dipping, is not improbable, in regard that (as was noted before) what we read (in *Dan.* 4. 25.) propheſied of *Nebuchadnezzar*, viz. that they ſhould *wet him with the dew of Heaven*, cannot mean, that he ſhould be *all immerſed*, or plunged into it, but that he ſhould be *all over* wetted with the falling, or ſprinkling of it upon him. And yet the *Syriac Verſ.* reads that place, *rore cœli intingêris*, as *Arias Montan. rore cœli infundêris*, i. e. thou ſhalt be *wetted* with, or thou ſhalt have *poured* upon thee, the dew of Heaven. And this may clear *Martinius*, when he renders βαπτισμὸς to be *merſio, immerſio, ſeu intinctio*, to mean, not the ſame thing

thing by *intinctio*, that he meant by *immersio*, but to have intended, as by the first a partial, and by the second a total dipping, so by the third a wetting, whether by a dipping total or partial, or whether by any other way.

§. 3. Thus say the *Lexicographers*. And if there be reason to believe them that are skilful in their own Art; then so many Masters of words speaking of a word within the sphear of their own consideration, and saying that βαπτισμὸς, besides the special import of *immersion*, hath also the general signification of *lotion*, and *ablution*, we may with reason believe it so to signifie; and so not be necessitated by vertue of its proper signification always to understand it of a total immersion.

§. 4. And this consideration undoubtedly, besides what other they might have, was that which sway'd so much both with Interpreters, and Expositors, and Didactical Divines so to understand, and render the word.

§. 5. Thence saith *Pareus*, *Baptismus* with the Greeks imports *any washing* or cleansing, whether it be done by *dipping*, or *sprinkling*. *Piscator* interprets the word βαπτισμοῖς in *Heb.* 9. 10. by *ablutionibus*, washings (as our English Version renders it:) and so does *Beza* too; and *Guilliandus* upon the place. And the like doth *Gagneius*, adding this for a reason (as *Guilliandus* also doth) because if they had toucht any unclean thing, *Statim ablui illos oportebat*, they ought presently to be washed. So *Erasmus*, *Illyricus*, *Pagnin*; so the *Tigurine*, *Arabic*, and *Æthiopic* Versions; so *Estius*, *Menochius*, *Ribera*, and others noted by Mr. *Pool* in his *Synopsis* on this place.

Baptismus Græcis quævis est lotio seu ablutio, sive immersione, sive aspersione fiat. Par. *in* Heb. 9. 10.

§. 6. Thence *Ursin* renders βαπτισμὸς and βάπτισμα, as well by *ablutio* a washing, as by *mersio* a dipping; and in his definition of baptism makes *lavacrum* a washing to

Baptismus est externum aquæ lavacrum à Christo mandatum, &c. Ursin. *Explic. Catech. q.* 69. *Baptismus secundùm Etymi sui rationem*

communiter significat quamvis ablutionem, &c. Trelcat. *Institut. l. 2. c. de Baptismo, p. 187. Baptismi vox immersionem & aspersionem significat, &c.* Wolleb. *Christ. Theolog. l. 1. c 23. can. 1. pag. 120.* Bucan. *loc. com. 47. pag. 605.*

Baptismus dicitur intinctio id est ablutio corporis exterior facta sub formâ verborum præscriptâ. P. Lomb. *4. Sent. dist. 3. pars 1. Baptismus est lotio sive ablutio in aqua.* Nic. de Orbel. *4. Sent. d. 4. qu. 1. de Baptismo. Βαπτισμὸς autem Græcis etiam tinctio, & intinctio (quod Latinè dicitur) explicatur.* Isidorus, *l. 6. Etymolog. cap. de officiis, & sæpe* Tertullianus *in lib. de Baptismo, & contra Marcionem. Sed & ipse Magister Sententiarum, l. 4. dist. 3. c. 1. Item & lotio dicitur, & ablutio, non solùm immersio. Unde illud* Juvenal. *Sat. 2. de Sacerdotibus Eleusinæ Cereris,* Cecropiam soliti Baptæ lassare Corytto. *Ergo non soli baptizantur, qui toti aquis merguntur, aut immerguntur, ut iste, (sc.* Bellarminus*) putat, & seipsum infra, c. 26. refutat: sed & qui aquâ solùm tinguntur, ex verâ Baptismi significatione,* be the *Genus* of it. *Trelcatius* saith, *Baptismus*, according to the Etymology of it, signifies commonly *quamvis ablutionem*, any ablution or cleansing, which is made by water, but especially the Legal, and Judaical lustrations and purgations. *Wollebius* saith, the word Baptism signifies *dipping* and *sprinkling*, and from the consequent thereto, ablution or cleansing by washing. *Bucanus* saith that by *βαπτισμὸς* and *βάπτισμα* is signified *immersion, intinction*, and from the consequent thereto *ablution*. And that the word *Baptismus* is taken properly in Scripture *pro simplici ablutione*, simply for washing, whether Levitical, or Pharisaical. *Pet. Lombard* explains the intinction in baptism by ablution. So *Nicol. de Orbellis* saith, Baptism is a washing or ablution in water. *Lambert. Danæus* renders *βαπτισμὸς* by *tinction*, and *intinction*. Yet adds, that it signifies also *lotion*, and *ablution*, and not only *immersion*: and that not only are they baptized, who are dipped wholly into water, but they also, that are *tinged* or *wetted* with water. *Tilenus* saith, if we regard the etymology of the word *Baptismus*, it signifies *dipping*, and also *sprinkling*, &c. *Keckerman* defines Baptism by Perfusion. And *Wæus* saith it hath always been held indifferent in the Church whether *dipping* or *sprinkling* were used, &c.

Can.

Can. de Trinâ Conſecr. diſt. 4. Dana. Reſponſio ad Bellarm. Tom. de Sacram. c. 1. pag. 311, 312. Baptiſmus, ſi etymon vocis ſpectemus, immerſionem ſignificat, atque etiam aſperſionem, quo ſenſu uſurpatur, Mat. 7 4. *& à conſequenti ablutionem, &c.* Tilenus *de Baptiſmo Diſput. 1. Theſ. 2. p. 883. Baptiſmus in genere, vel merſionem ſignificat, vel ablutionem aut perfuſionem. Id. Theolog. Syſtema. Diſp. 37. Th ſ. 1. p. 1077. Baptiſmus eſt Sacramentum N. T. quo aquæ perfuſione, in nomine Patris, Filii & S. S. factâ ſignificatur & obſignatur fidelibus beneficium purgationis à peccato per filium Dei, & regenerationis ad vitam æternam.* Keckermann, *Syſtem. Theolog. l. 3. c. 8. p. 451.* See the Author, where is much more and very ſubſtantial and pertinent. *Signum rituale ſeu Ceremoniale in hoc Sacramento eſt baptizatio ſeu lotio in nomine Patris, Filii, & Spiritus ſancti, ſicut Chriſtus expreſſè mandavit,* Matth. 28. & Marc. 16. *Unde & lavacrum aquæ in verbo,* Eph. 5. 26. *Et lavacrum regenerationis,* Tit. 3. 5. *& depoſitio ſordium corporis ab Apoſtolo* Petro *per Metonymiam effecti dicitur.* 1 Pet. 2. 29. *An verò unâ, an trinâ merſione ſit baptizandum, indifferens ſemper judicatum fuit in Eccleſiâ Chriſtianâ, quemadmodum etiam an immerſione, an verò aſperſione utendum, cum expreſſum illius mandatum nullum extet; & exempla adſperſionis, non minus quàm immerſionis in Scripturis poſſint deprehendi, &c.* Anton. Walæus *Synopſis pur. Theolog. Diſp. 44. Theſ. 18, 19. p. 605. Et ita baptiſmus loquendo ſecundùm vim vocabuli, nihil dicit niſi lotionem: limitatur tamen in propoſito ad ſignandum unum de 7. Sacramentis novæ legis,* Guil. Vorrilong in l. 4. Sent. diſt. 3.

§. 7. What weight now there is in the word of theſe Writers, who were men of eminency in the Church for their learning, that we have to perſwade, or ſatisfie us, that βαπτισμὸς doth not neceſſarily always import a total immerſion, but is uſed more generally to ſignifie any kind of waſhing, even though by perfuſion, or aſperſion.

§. 8. If it be enquired, what might move theſe learned Perſons to think the word capable of this Interpretation, it is eaſie to ſuppoſe them drawn ſo to think, by ſome application of the word to ſuch things, as were either not capable of a total merſation, or were not uſed, at leaſt in their times, to be neceſſarily wholly immerſed, whenever waſhed. And one place, wherein the word is by them reputed ſo to be uſed, is *Mark* 7. 4. where, among the Traditions received by the Jews from the Elders, the Evangeliſt reckons βαπτισμὸς ποτηρίων, καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων.

χλινῶν καὶ χαλκῶν, which we Engliſh not the *Baptiſms*, nor the *dippings*, but (by the more general word) *the waſhing* or waſhings) of *cups, and pots, and brazen veſſels*, and *of tables*. And ſo again in *ver.* 8. we find βαπτισμὸς ξεστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων, *the waſhing* (or waſhings) of *pots and cups*. And as we render it waſhing (as *Tindal* alſo doth) ſo accordingly the moſt Interpreters render it by *lotiones*, that is, waſhings. So *Montan. Pagnin. Beza, Piſcator*, the *Syriac* and other Verſions. And the learned Dr. *Lightfoot* ſaith, that the word applied to the things following doth not always denote dipping or plunging in, but ſometimes *waſhing only*, or even an *aſperſion* or *ſprinkling*.

Quæ vox ad ſequentia applicata non ſemper tinctionem aut immerſionem, ſed interdum lotionem tantùm, vel etiam aſperſionem denotat, ut notat Maimon. *præcipuè* poculum benedictionis. *Lightfoot. Vid. Pool. Synopſ. in loc.*

§. 9. And firſt for their *cups and pots*, it is not neceſſary, that we alway underſtand their waſhing to be by a *total immerſion*. Who being bidden to rinſe, or waſh a pot or cup, preſently chops the whole pot or cup into the water, and thinks it not waſhed unleſs it be totally immerſed? what? leaves he no part of it out? not ſo much as ear, ſtart, or handle? not that part of it by which he holds it? And what if the pot or cup be to be rinſed or waſhed at a pump, or cock? where's the total immerſion of it then? When *Thetis* dipt her ſon in the lake of *Lethe*, to render him invulnerable, who can ſay but he was dipt in *Lethe*? and yet that part ſtill remained undipped, whereby ſhe held him, and where afterward *Alexander* wounded him. His dipping was not a total immerſion. No more was it neceſſary ſo to be in the waſhing, and even merſation of theſe things. If they were any more than rinſed, yet hardly were they totally immerſed. And to render it probable, we read that the *cup*

For not to have been dipt in Lethe *Lake Could ſave the ſon of* Thetis *from to die, &c.* Spencer.

of blessing was but to be dipped on *the outside*, the inside rinsed. But if it must have been totally *immersed*, then inside and outside and all must have been washed together, and that by mersation. And would they observe more strictness in the daily washings of every Pot and Cup, as oft as need was, than of that *cup of blessing*, which they employed as a Sacred Utensil in their giving of thanks to God after meat, and for whose washing they had a particular Tradition? He must be very sanguine, that can believe any such thing. And however that their cleansing of their Cups and Platters was but partial, and did not extend to the whole, as it must have been had their washing been by a total immersion, seems apparent by our Saviours allusion to that custom of theirs (in *Matth.* 23.25.) where he tells them of their cleansing τὸ ἔξωθεν ποτηρίου, the outside of the cup and platter.

Pocock, *Porta Mos.* p. 404.

§. 10. And what? would nothing less than immersion, and that a total one, serve for the washing of their brasen vessels, and those not all *small ones*: but so big, some of them, that they held water, for the cleansing of other vessels by water poured out thence; nay, and the vessels themselves too, fitted for that purpose by the wideness of their mouths?

Pocock, *Porta Mos.* p. 406.

§. 11. And must the *Tables* too, (or *beds* rather) be cleansed by mersation? and nothing less than a total immersion be sufficient for their cleansing? How difficult if at all practicable, is this, to dip *whole tables*, (or what is worse, *whole beds*) not untaken in pieces, and wholly into the water? And how troublesom, and chargeable too, to be always taking them in pieces in order to be dipt, as oft as they might hap to be defiled? and that (so many ways were there of their defilement) might happen to be very often.

§. 12. And suppose we render it *dipping*, or by *washing* to understand such a washing as was performed by *dipping*: what? will nothing less than a total immersion of every thing

thing ſerve to name it *dipped*? muſt there be a total immerſion, or elſe no dipping? The Prieſt, when a Sin-offering was to be offered (*Lev.* 4. 6, 17.) was to *dip his finger* in the blood of the Bullock and ſprinkle it. Could nothing ſerve here for the performance of his duty, but the *dipping of his whole finger* into the blood? muſt it all in? no part remain undipped? It is not ſo ſaid. It might truly be ſaid, he *dipped his finger* into it, if ſome *part of his finger* were but dipped therein; if he did but take ſome of the blood with his finger to *ſprinkle*, as it is after in the ſame chapter ſaid he ſhould do, to put upon the horns of the altar.

ver. 25, 30, 34.

§. 13. But to make this more plain; It is ſaid in *Lev.* 14. that for the cleanſing of a *Leper*, the Prieſt ſhould take ſome of a log of oil, and pour it into the palm of his own left hand, and ſhould *dip his right finger* in the oil, that was in his left hand, and ſhould ſprinkle of the oil with his finger ſeven times. I would fain know how a man ſhould hold in the *palm of his hand* (for ſo is the word, and not the *hollow of his fiſt*) ſo much oil as ſhould be ſufficient *to dip* all his whole finger (in the ſenſe that our *Anabaptiſts* do underſtand *dipping*) in it. The improbability, or rather impoſſibility of which the LXX. diſcerning render the Text, βάψει τ δάκτυλον ἀπὸ τ ἐλαίυ, *He ſhall* (not dip his finger into, but) *die*, or *wet his finger* with the oil; that is the dipping, and all the dipping they underſtood in this place. And yet if that could not be, ſtill his finger might be ſaid to be dipped in it, though it were not all at once immerſed into it, or though ſome part of it, after all, remained undipped. So then theſe waſhings here, ſuppoſe we grant them to be performed by merſation, might intend ſomething leſs than a total immerſion: and then ſtill no neceſſity of interpreting the word βαπτισμὸς in that ſenſe.

§. 14. Another is *Heb.* 9. 10. where the Apoſtle enumerating the ſeveral ſorts of external ordinances, beſides

Gifts

Gifts and Sacrifices, which were impoſed on the People of the Jews during that *Levitical Oeconomy*, that they were to be exerciſed under, until the time of reformation, mentions among them διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, *divers waſhings*. Now unleſs thoſe waſhings here intended were all immerſions, and total ones too, it cannot be avoided, but that βαπτισμοὺς, the only word here uſed to comprehend all thoſe divers waſhings, is capable of ſignifying other ways of waſhing, than by a total immerſion: and ſo cannot by the force of its ſignification compel us always to underſtand baptiſm to mean a total immerſion, & to conclude that waſhing, which is not by ſuch immerſion, to be no baptiſm.

§. 15. Now that theſe baptiſms were not all immerſions, may appear from the conſideration of ſeveral *Perſons*, and *Things*, appointed to be waſhed. There were three ſorts of Perſons amongſt the Iſraelites that were to be waſhed: the Prieſts, the Levites, and the People after any pollution contracted upon them. Now if we conſult *the bare words of truth*, we ſhall find, upon examination, all theſe ſorts of Perſons waſhed, and yet not neceſſarily always by immerſion of their whole body, at leaſt as far as appears by Text of Scripture, unglоſſed by Rabbinical Traditions, and unſenſed with Anabaptiſtical Interpretations.

§. 16. Firſt the *Prieſts*, of all other, as being the moſt holy, one would think ſhould have been dipped, if that in the eſteem of God were a higher degree of ſanctification, than other ways of waſhing, and eſpecially at their conſecration to holy Orders. And yet no ſuch thing appears of them. Their Conſecration is appointed in *Exod.* 29. Of the order whereof, as God gives it unto *Moſes*, part was their waſhing. That is preſcribed in the fourth Verſe. But how? By dipping! Not a word of that there. How then? Hear, what God ſays. *And Aaron and his Sons ſhalt thou bring unto the Door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation*, and *thou ſhalt waſh them with water.* *

* Λούσεις ὕδατι, lavabis eos; *LXX. Targ. Onkel. Samarit.* Lava, *Arab.* Ablue, *Syriac.* cum laveris, *vulg. Lat.*

Mark,

Mark, 'tis said, *thou shalt wash them*; not, *thou shalt dip them*. Nor does the Original word there used (which is רָחַץ) signifie any such thing, but only, as *Pagnin* tells us, *abluere à sordibus corporis*, to cleanse from the filths of the body by washing; and so *Danæus* too. And accordingly when *Moses* did execute this command (*Levit.* 8. 6.) the word used to express their washing is the same word still. When the *Hebrews* would express a dipping, they have another word for that, *viz.* טָבַל, which they use in that case. And the not using of that word here, is intimation fair enough, that it was not the washing mostly signified by that word, that was here intended. Here's one Baptism or washing then, and yet not necessarily to be understood of dipping.

רָחַץ *est lavare & mundare quidpiam à sordibus*, Lamb. Danæ. *Isagog. de Sacrament. c.* 21. *part.* 4. *pag.* 497.

רָחַץ *Levit, see Buxtorf.*

§. 17. From the *Priests* let us go on to the *Levites*, and see after what manner they were to be washed, at their consecration to their office. That we have set down in *Num.* 8. 5, 6, 7. *And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, Take the Levites from among the Children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: sprinkle water of purifying upon them, and let them shave all their flesh, and let them wash their clothes*, and *so make themselves clean.* See! not a word here of *dipping* them in order to their purification, nor any other way of washing prescribed, but that of *sprinkling*. *Thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them, sprinkle water of purifying upon them.* And if it were not sufficiently apparent from hence, that *sprinkling*, and that of water, was used for cleansing, that of *Ezek.* 36. 25. would make it appear; where by way of promise of what God would do for *Israel* in after times, he saith, *Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.* Here's another Baptism, or washing; yet not by *dipping*, but even plainly by *sprinkling*.

§. 18. From

§. 18. From the *Levites* paſs we on unto the *People*: and for their purification, after pollution, is preſcribed *waſhing*. But how? by dipping? ſo indeed if the *Anabaptiſts* will give us leave to believe them, the *Jewiſh* Traditions ſay, and that of the whole body, hair and all, and all at one dip, and that ſo ſtrictly, that if but the tip of the little finger miſs dipping, he that is dipped is ſtill in his uncleanneſs. But does the Text ſay any ſuch thing? No ſuch matter. And they that ſtrictly hold us to Text, muſt preſs no more than Text upon us. They muſt claim no benefit by Tradition to themſelves, that will not allow the benefit of it unto others. Let them but allow us that, and we ſhall have our Infants baptized preſently. And let it be by *dipping*, with all my heart, ſo no unlawfulneſs be affixed on the doing it otherwiſe.

Maimonid. in Mikvaoth. c. 1. vid. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matth. 6. 3. pag. 47. Ainſworth on Levit. 15. 5, 11.

§. 19. In *Levit.* 14. we have the cleanſing of a *Leper* preſcribed. And how is he to be cleanſed? By *dipping*? That is not ſaid. How then? Even by *ſprinkling*. For ſo 'tis ſaid in Ver. 7. *And he* (*i. e.* the Prieſt) *ſhall ſprinkle upon him that is to be cleanſed from the Leproſie ſeven times, and ſhall pronounce him clean.* *Sprinkling* then again appears to be a way of waſhing, and that for cleanſing: for after the Prieſt had ſo waſhed him by *ſprinkling*, he was to pronounce him clean. But it is ſaid (v. 8.) that *he ſhall waſh himſelf in water that he may be clean*; and again (ver. 9.) *he ſhall waſh his fleſh in water*, and he ſhall be clean. True, in order to his coming into the Camp, and after that into his Tent. But ſtill that waſhing is not ſaid ſhould be by *dipping*. The original word is here alſo רָחַץ not טָבַל, and ſignifies only in general to *waſh*, and not ſpecifically to dip, or totally immerſe, as we have noted before. And as the LXX. here render

רָחַץ *lavit, eluit, abluit aquâ corpus, faciem, manus, pedes, veſtes. Leigh. Crit. Sacr.*

render it by λούσεται, he shall wash; so *lavo* and *abluo*, general words to wash or cleanse with washing, are the only Latine expressions whereby the sentiments of other Interpreters, of what Language soever, are conveyed to us.

Et lavabitur aquâ, Vulg. Lat. Targum Onkel. Lavabitur in aqua, Transl. Lat. Septuag. Se autem lavabit in aquis, Text. Heb. Samarit. & abluet se aquâ, Syriac. & lavabit sese, Arab.

§. 20. In *Levit.* 15. is prescribed the cleansing of Men and Women in their Issues; and of Persons defiled by touch of them. That cleansing among other rites is to be made, not necessarily by *immersion* (there is no dipping mentioned in the case) but by *ablution*, by such a washing as is termed *bathing*. He shall bath himself in water: so 'tis said, *v.* 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 21, 22, 27. *He shall bath his flesh in running water*, v. 13. Now bathing surely doth not necessarily import in its signification a total immersion: Men do not use always to plunge themselves over head and ears into their Bath: a going into the water, and a partial mersation of some part of their bodies, with an application of water to other parts of them with their hands, and a frication added thereto, I think, takes in the whole of what is necessary to, or usual in bathing. Nor can I discern any thing more to have been done, either by *Bathsheba*, or *Susanna*, to themselves, in that washing of themselves, which is vulgarly called bathing. And the *Hebrew* word, the same we have noted before, signifies no such thing strictly and specifically; nor is so rendered by any Interpreter that I yet meet with: λούω in Greek, and *lavo* in Latine, (and what comes of it) being all the words that the Oriental Versions are rendred

Εἶδε γυναῖκα λουομένην. 2 Sam. 11. 2. ἐνέγκατε δή μοι ἔλαιον καὶ σμήγματα — ὅπως λούσωμαι. Susan. v. 17.

In aquis se lavabit, Pagn. Interlin. lavabitur aquâ, LXX. Transl. Lat. aquis, Targ. Onk. in aquis, Samarit. lavet se aquâ, Arab. totus aquâ, Vulg. Lat. Vid. Bib. Polyglot.

rendred by. So then no neceſſity of dipping in this caſe neither.

§. 21. In *Deut.* 21. when uncertain murder was committed, the Elders of the City next adjoining are appointed to waſh their hands over a beheaded heifer, *v.* 6. Here's waſhing of the hands appointed, but no dipping. The Original word here alſo is רָחַץ not טָבַל; and ſo doth not enforce to interpret it of immerſion. And as νίπτομαι, which does not ſignifie to dip, is the word the LXX uſe to render it by, ſo *lavabunt*, and *laverint*, which do not ſignifie it neither (I mean ſtrictly and ſpecifically) are the words whereby the Oriental Verſions of that place are interpreted unto us. So here is another waſhing, yet not by a total immerſion.

§. 22. In *Exod.* 30.18,19,20. *Moſes* is appointed to make a *laver of braſs to waſh withal, and to put water therein, for* Aaron *and his ſons to waſh thereat*: and they are accordingly appointed, upon pain of death, *to waſh when they went into the tabernacle.* But ſtill not a word of immerſion ſpoken of all this while. The word for waſhing here too is רָחַץ, whoſe import we have often enough declared to be for *ablution*, not for *immerſion*. And beſides though *Moſes* be appointed, when he had placed the laver, to put water therein, they are not appointed to put their hands and feet into it, and waſh *therein*, but to waſh them *thereat*. And for conveniency thereof Mr. *Pool* tells us from *Munſter* and *Fagius*, that it had many ſpouts or pipes, whereby water was let out for their uſe. And according to this appointment it is ſaid in *Exod.* 40.43,31. that *Moſes did ſet the laver between the Tent of the Congregation and the altar, and put water there to waſh withal.* And *that* Moſes *and* Aaron *and his ſons waſhed their hands and feet thereat*, (not *therein.*) The original word for waſhing is here ſtill the ſame: and *lavo* the only Latin word that I meet with, whereby the Oriental Verſions of it are rendred.

Fiſtulas multas habebat, per quas emittebatur aqua. Pool Synopſ. in loc.

§. 23. In

§. 23. In *Levit.* 6. 27. The Garment, whereon the blood of the Sin-offering was ſprinkled, is appointed to be waſhed. And in *Lev.* 13. 6. the garment of him, who had a *white ſcab* ariſing in his fleſh, ſuſpected to be the *Leproſie*, but judged by the Prieſt not to be that, is appointed to be waſhed. And in *Lev.* 14. 8, 9. he who was to be *cleanſed* from the *Leproſie* was appointed to *waſh* his garments. And again in *Levit.* 15. 6, 7, 8, 10, *&c.* perſons having a *running iſſue*, or defiled by the touch of ſuch perſons, are appointed to waſh their clothes. But ſtill this waſhing is not expreſſed by טָבַל, which ſignifies to *dip*, but by כָּבַס, which only in general ſignifies to *waſh*, or *whiten* with waſhing, not ſtrictly to immerſe or dip.

כָּבַס *lavare, lavacro candidare.* Pagnin. כָּבַס *lavit, purgavit, abluit, eluit pannum vel veſtem, ut albeſcat* Leigh. *Crit. Sacr. Generale eſt* כָּבַס i. e. *candidum facere. Danæus, Iſag. part.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 21. *p.* 497. כָּבַס *lavit, abluit.* Buxtorf.

§. 24. And ſuppoſe the way of *waſhing* of clothes were by a total *merſation* (as I am apt to think it was, though the Hebrew word do not neceſſarily enforce ſo much, becauſe πλύνω is the word uſed by the LXX. to expreſs their way of waſhing) yet ſtill that makes againſt a *total immerſion* of the perſons, at leaſt according to the obſervation of the great St. *Athanaſius*. For he ſpeaking of the legal Baptiſms hath theſe words: Πᾶς δ' ἀκάθαρτος ἐλούετο ὕδατι, ἐκλύνετο δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια, *i. e.* every unclean perſon waſhed, (or was waſhed) with water, but he plunged his garments. So then the waſhing of the *perſon* was not the ſame with the waſhing of the *garments*. And then if the waſhing of the *garments* was by a *plunging* or *total immerſion* of them into the water, then the waſhing of the perſon was not ſo. And ſo we have here a diverſity of *baptiſms* confirmed, and yet one of them not by a total immerſion.

D. Athanaſ. Dict. & Interpret. Parab. S. Scripturæ, Tom. 2. *p.* 426.

§. 25. To conclude this enumeration of particulars appointed

pointed to be waſhed. In *Exod.* 29. 17. we read that the *inwards and legs of the Ram*, Sacrificed at the Conſecration of the Prieſt, were appointed to be *waſhed*. And the like we read appointed to be done to the *inwards* and *legs* of the *burnt-offering* brought by any of the people, whether it were of the herd, or of the flock, *Levit.* 1. 9, 13. And this we find done by *Aaron*, when he offered up the burnt-offering for himſelf, *Levit.* 9. 14. But ſtill it is only רָחַץ that is uſed to ſignifie this waſhing, and not טָבַל: that waſhing is not appointed to be ſtrictly by *dipping*, but only in ſuch a way as might ſerve for *cleanſing*, which might be by *dipping*, or other *waſhing* or *rinſing*; whereof our own kitchins, if we ſhould look into them, might daily afford us viſible inſtances: no doubt being but that many Joints of our meat are ſufficiently waſhed and cleanſed by pouring water on them, or rubbing them with water, which yet are never in formal manner wholly immerſed.

§. 26. And thus I have ſhewn variety of waſhings under the law, and yet none of them neceſſarily, by virtue of the ſignification of the words whereby they are preſcribed, implying *dipping*, excluſively as to all other ways of waſhing. Perhaps it might be a task, not eaſily performed, to ſhew where any perſon, or thing, that was to be *cleanſed*, was appointed to be *dipped* for the *cleanſing* of it. For the cleanſing of *other* things, we read of things appointed to be dipped, as the *Prieſts finger* in *oil*, *Lev.* 4. 6, 17. (which yet I have ſhewn not to ſignifie a total immerſion, though טָבַל be the original of it;) a *living bird*, *cedar wood*, *ſcarlet* and *hyſſop* in the blood of a *bird ſlain* over running water (which alſo I have ſpoke to before, ſhewing the impoſſibility of proving thence a *total immerſion* by him that ſtrictly ſtands to Scripture text:) *hyſſop* in the water of Separation for the purifying of the unclean, *Numb.* 19. 18. (and yet even here reaſon will not ſuggeſt to a man a total immerſion of that hyſſop into the water, but that ſo much of it was left un-

dipped, as was held by the hand of him that was to *ſprinkle* the water with it, unleſs we ſuppoſe he dipped his hand too into the water: but that was to exceed the order preſcribed, which was to dip the hyſſop, not his hand into it:) but of things appointed to be dipped for their *own* purification, as my own memory ſuggeſts to me no inſtance, ſo perhaps it may not be very eaſie for another, upon the ſuddain, to give an example.

§ 27. And now lay all theſe things together, and how little a ſhare will *immerſions*, eſpecially *total ones*, have in our Apoſtles βαπτισμοῖς, *waſhings*? how much more agreeably to the nature of the things is that word there rendred *waſhings*? and how invincible an inſtance is that Text, of the word's ſignifying not always, and only a *total imerſion*, but of its ſignifying other ways of waſhing, whether by a *partial merſation*, *affuſion*, or *conſperſion*, and ſo a fair evidence of the truth of a *Chriſtian baptiſm*, without the ſtrictneſs of an *Anabaptiſtical dipping*.

§ 28. And yet for further ſtrength, though we admit ſome, nay ſeveral of the waſhings here underſtood to have been *total immerſions*, (as I am willing ſo far to credit the Hebrew Doctors, as to apprehend the *cleanſing* of men and women in their *iſſues*, *Lev.* 15. might have been by a total *dipping of them*) yet ſtill, unleſs they were all ſuch, and there was no diverſity in any from them, the caſe will be all one: For βαπτισμοῖς will ſtill be to be underſtood of *thoſe waſhings* that were *no immerſions*, as well as of thoſe that were. And that there was a diverſity betwixt them, and that they were not all the ſame ſort of waſhing, for inſtance, total immerſions, is ſufficiently intimated in the Epithet here added thereto by the Apoſtle, διαφόροις *diverſe*. If the waſhings were *diverſe*, then they were not all the ſame, and then not all total immerſions, ſuppoſe ſome were ſuch, but ſome *partial merſations*, ſome *affuſions*, ſome *ſprinklings*: which again proves the thing in queſtion, that that may be a *true baptiſm*, which yet is not a total immerſion.

§ 29. It

§. 29. It may be said that *diverse*, doth not signifie always a difference in *species* or sort, but in *number*: as appears, 2 *Chron.* 21. 4. 2 *Chron.* 30. 11. *Mark* 8. 3. *Act.* 19. 9. But I answer, that though that be true of the English word *diverse*, which is so used in those four Texts: yet it is not so of the Greek word here, διάφορος, which is not the word for *diverse* in any of those Texts, but τινὲς, *some*, as in *Mark* 8. *and Act.* 19. or ἄνθρωποι, *men*, as in 2 *Chron.* 30. or nothing expressed, as in 2 *Chron.* 21: as there are other words for it in other Texts of Scripture, *viz.* ποικίλος, γένος, ἔξαλλος, πολυτρόπως, *&c.* as he that pleases upon examination may find, but not *that*. That word διάφορος is never used in the *Greek*, either of the *New Testament* or *Old*, but where a *diversity* of kind or sort is intimated. In the *New Testament* I find it but once used, besides this Text, *viz.* *Rom.* 12. 6. where we have χαρίσματα διάφορα *differing gifts*: but that must needs be in kind or sort, unless *prophecie*, *ministry*, *teaching*, *exhortation*, be gifts all of a kind or sort. In the Old Testament I find it thrice, but every where signifying variety of sort or kind. As for instance, *Lev.* 19. 19. *Thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed*, [ὃ κατασπερεῖς διάφορον] that is [*diverso semine*, as the *Vulg. Lat.*] seeds of several sorts or kinds. And if it be not clear enough in it self, it may receive Light from the foregoing clause of the same Verse, and where we have the word *diverse* too, (though διάφορος be not in the Greek there) but fully to our purpose. *Thou shalt not let thy cattel gender with a diverse kind* [*alterius generis*, *of another kind or sort*, according to the *Vulg. Lat.*] So that the field was no more to be sowed (*immixtionibus*, as *Pagnin* renders it) with mixed seeds, than cattel to be bred from *promiscuous mixtures* of beasts of diverse kinds. So again, *Deut.* 22. 9. the same precept is renewed, and διάφορον is the Greek of the *Septuagints* Version of that Text, *Thou shalt not sow thy Vineyard with diverse seeds*, that is [*mixturis* as *Pagnin.*] with mixtures of seeds, seeds of diverse

 sorts,

sorts, or kinds mingled together. Lastly in *Dan.* 7.7. after the sight of one beast like a *Lion*, and another like a *Bear*, and a third like a *Leopard*, appeared a fourth *diverse* from all the beasts that were before it, that is, differing in sort or kind, as much from all them, as they one from another: and here the word for diverse is διάφορον in the *Septuagint* [*dissimilis ab omni bestia*, Transl. Lat. of LXX. *variam à cunctis*, *Pagnin. diversa ab omnibus belluis*, *Arab. Syriac.*] According then to the use of διάφορος in the Scriptures, it must import a *diversity of kind or sort* in the things whereto it is applied; and then by διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, in the Text, must be meant *washings of several sorts or kinds*, and then not all of one sort or kind, suppose total immersion were one; then partial mersation, affusion, or aspersion must come within the compass of that word's signification; and then there may be a baptism without a total immersion.

§. 30. After this I may add, perhaps not inconveniently, that whereas St. *Athanasius*, (or he whoever that Ancient Author was, who is mistaken for St. *Athanasius*,) reckons up *eight several baptisms*; the first of the *flood*; the Second that of *Moses* in the *Sea*; the Third the *legal baptism* of the *Jews* after *uncleanness*; the Fourth that of St. *John Baptist*; the Fifth that of *Jesus*; the Sixth of *Tears* (as when one *washes his bed*, as *David* did his every night, with *Tears*) the Seventh of *Martyrdom*, the Eighth of *eternal fire*, several of these are not immersions; and particularly not the first, for *Noah* and his family were not *dipped* into the flood (*rained upon* they were, and so the resemblance of their *baptizing* is made in *baptizing* by affusing or *sprinkling*, if ye will;) nor the Second, as I have shewn before; nor the Third universally, as I have also shewn, and himself doth intimate, whilest he expresses the reason for the Jews having that *baptism*, by saying that every unclean person ἐλούετο was *washed*; nor the Sixth, for that cannot be by *dipping* the

Dict. & Interpret. Parab. Script. Tom. 2. p. 426.

bed

bed in tears, but by dropping tears upon the bed, and is more properly a *baptiſm* by *ſprinkling*, than by dipping; and even the Fourth, however the Fifth will abide a diſpute. There may then be a baptizing, where there is no immerſing, at leaſt according to St. *Athanaſius*; or that Ancient Writer. But not in this Author alone; but in other of the *Ancients* we read of a Baptiſm of *Blood* and *Tears*; I know ſaith *Greg. Naz.* of a Fourth *Baptiſm*, that by *Martyrdom* and *Blood*, wherewith Chriſt himſelf was *Baptized*; and I know of a *Fifth* yet, that of *Tears*: And, (ſaith the Author of the Reſponſes to *Antiochus*, attributed to St. *Athanaſius*) God hath granted unto man *Three purging Baptiſms*, that of *Water*, that of the *Teſtimony* of ones *own Blood*, and the Third, that of *Tears*: ſo St. *Baſil* tells us of a *Martyr* that was *Baptized* into Chriſt in his own *Blood*.

Οἶδα καὶ τέταρτον βάπτισμα, τὸ διὰ μαρτυρίου καὶ αἵματος· ᾧ καὶ αὐτὸς χειρὸς ἐβαπτίσατο.— Οἶδα καὶ πέμπτον ἔτι τῶν δακρύων— ὡς ὁ λέων καθ' ἑκάστην νύκτα τὴν κλίνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν στρωμνὴν τοῖς δάκρυσιν, *Gr. Naz. Orat.* 39. *Tom.* 1. *pag.* 634. *Edit. Morell.*

Τέλεα βαπτίσματα καθαρτικὰ πάσης οἵας δήποτε ἁμαρτίας ὁ Θεὸς τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐδώρησε·—τὸ λάγνον δὲ τὸ ὕδατος καὶ πάλιν, τὸ διὰ μαρτυρίας τῶν ἰδίων αἱμάτων καὶ τρίτον τὸ διὰ δακρύων, ὅπερ καὶ ἡ πόρνη ἐκαθαίρετο. *D. Athan. Reſp. ad qu.* 72. *ad Antioch. Tom.* 2. *p.* 360. *edit. Sonnii & Morellii.*

Ἐβαπτίσθη οὐ χειρὸν, οὐχ ὕδατι, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς οἰκείας πίστεως, οὐκ ἐν ὕδατι, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι, *D. Baſil. Hom. de* 40. *Martyr. Tom.* 1. *p.* 533. *edit. Morellii.*

§ 31. Neither then from what is ſaid of βάπτω, nor of βαπτίζω, nor of βαπτισμὸς, (*root*, *body*, nor *branch*) doth it appear, that the *Baptiſmal waſhing* is neceſſarily, by the force of βαπτίζω, to be by a *total immerſion*: nor is our Saviour, when he ſaid μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτὸς, to be underſtood, as if he had ſaid, make all Nations diſciples by *dipping* them, but by *waſhing* them; *i.e.* in ſuch manner as the time, place, and perſon may admit, whether by *immerſion*, *affuſion*, or *conſperſion*.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Hebrew טבל, *and the Syriac* עמר חסא: *and that they do not universally signifie a total immersion.*

§. 1. BUT perhaps it will be said, that our Saviour did not deliver his mind in *Greek*. In what Language then? In *Hebrew*, or *Syriac*, doubtless: but in whether 'tis hard to say. But what then? what? why then, though βαπτίζω, either in its own native import, or in the *Hellenistical* use of it, might signifie not always a *total immersion*, but sometimes something less than that, even an *affusion* or *aspersion* of water, yet it is not to be taken here, so as to signifie any thing less than that word did, wherein our Saviour deliver'd his mind: and if that signified only a *total* immersion, then βαπτίζω, what ever it may signifie in it self, ought with us to signifie nothing less than so.

§. 2. To this I answer first, that it being not certainly known in what Language our Saviour spake, when he gave the order for baptizing, the Language, that he spake in, ought not to be urged in this case, so as to prescribe to the use of the word, that we have his mind delivered in unto us. Tell us exactly the particular word that he spake, and what was the exact signification of that word, and, unless we can shew a reason for a dispensation, we will do what that word requireth of us.

§. 3. Secondly the *Holy Spirit*, which excited St. *Matthew* to write his Gospel, and assisted him in the writing of it, knew his mind, and suggested to his *Evangelist* such a word, as was expressive of his mind: and what that word doth import, that we take to be his mind, and the very thing designed by his word, in what Language soever he spake, whether *Hebrew*,

That passage in Tilenus, Alioqui Apostolis, Syrorum idiomate, quo vide-

brew, or *Syriac*. And ſo, for as much as βαπτίζω, the word dictated by the *Spirit*, as we ſuppoſe, to the *Evangeliſt*, admits of a *latitude*, at leaſt in *Sacred Authors*, if not in profane alſo, ſo as to ſignifie other ways of *baptizing*, than by a *total immerſion*, therefore we are to underſtand, that the word he delivered his mind in, were it *Hebrew* or *Syriac*, was alſo of the ſame import. And ſo we are where we were ſtill.

licet Chriſtus uſus fuerat, utendum fuiſſet, (Diſp. 1. de Bapt. Theſ. 17.) ſhews he thought that *Syriac* was the Language our Saviour ſpake.

§. 4. But ſuppoſe he ſpake *Hebrew*, or *Syriac*, What are the words he muſt be ſuppoſed to have ſpoken in this caſe? It will be ſaid, if *Hebrew*, טבל *Tabal*, if *Syriac*, ܛܒܰܠ *Amad*. Here is but ſuppoſition all this while, and no proof: unleſs thoſe Languages afforded no other words to expreſs waſhing, and particularly that kind of waſhing, which was uſed as the *ceremony for initiation of Diſciples* under the Diſcipline of a Maſter. And ſo, let thoſe words ſignifie what they will, there can no demonſtrative Argument be framed from them againſt us, and we may *baptize* our *children* ſtill, as we do, for all them.

Dr. Pocock, *Porta Moſis, pag.* 393.

§. 5. Yet ſuppoſe we join iſſues, and take it for granted, that the one, or the other, of theſe words, was the word that our Saviour delivered his mind in, and that proportionably to the import of that word we are to underſtand the word βαπτίζω, uſed by the *Evangeliſt*, whereby to expreſs his mind, will it thence follow that βαπτίζω muſt ſignifie a *total immerſion*? I hope not. If they do not neceſſarily ſignifie ſo much, then cannot βαπτίζω be affirmed to have ſo much neceſſarily imported in its ſignification.

§. 6. But how ſhall we know the juſt import of theſe words? Undoubtedly by conſulting Authors, or Lexicographers, skilful in thoſe Languages. If that may be ſtood to, all is well yet. For the Learned Dr. *Pocock* proves,

that though the word טבל (which signifies βαπτίζεσθαι) do import a *further degree* of *purgation*, than what is implied in נטל, or χερνίπτειν (which signifies to *wash* the *hands*) yet it does not necessarily import the mersation or *dipping of the whole body*. And learned *Schindler*, as he allows this Verb the strict signification of *immersion*, *dipping* in, or *plunging* for ablutions sake, so he stints not its signification to that, but allows it to signifie in a greater latitude, so to wash, not as that a thing may be cleansed, but only touch the moisture either in whole, or in part. And so Mr. *Leigh*, in his *Critica Sacra*.

—— Nec tamen totius corporis mersationem necessario indigitare. Dr. Pocock, ibid. טבל *tinxit, intinxit, mersit, immersit, tingendi, aut abluendi gratia demersit: ita usvit, ut res non mundetur, sed tantùm attingat humorem, vel tota, vel ex parte i. baptizavit, Schindler.*

§. 7. And as this hath already been made appear, by the instance of the *Priests* right finger dipped in the Oil contained in the palm of his left hand; so it will appear by further instances of the same, interpreted according to what reason could direct as fit to be done in those cases, or is actually done in the like. In *Exod.* 12. 22. order is given by *Moses* to the Elders of *Israel*, at the institution of the *Passeover*, first to kill a Lamb, and then to take a bunch of Hyssop, and *dip it in the blood of it*, and strike the Lintel, and the two side-Posts therewith. Now what Man of reason would ever think any more intended by *Moses*, but that he that took the Hyssop, as he held one end of the bunch in his hand, so he should *dip* the other end of it into the blood? Which of us being to act the same thing, and having no further directions than they appear to have had, would do any more than so? And who would not think the order exactly fulfilled in so doing? Who would ever dream of a necessity of *immersing* the whole bunch into the blood? or fancy it was not dipt at all, because not all dipt? Let us consult our reasons, and think like Men, and we cannot imagine any more than a partial

partial merſation of the bunch into the blood (*viz.* the buſhie end of it) to have been intended by *Moſes*, or practiſed by *Iſrael*. And then here will be one inſtance of this word's ſignifying leſs than a total dipping of that, which yet is ſaid to be dipped.

§. 8. And, the more to confirm it, we may note, (and it is obſervable) that the *Greek Interpreters* of this place, though they uſe βάπτειν in the caſe, yet they do not ſay, βάπτειν εἰς αἷμα, dipping it into the blood, but βάπτοντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, *dying* or *ſmearing* it with the blood, (which is a further inſtance, that βάπτω alſo doth not neceſſarily ſignifie always a *total immerſion*, (at leaſt, not in the judgment of thoſe Writers) but ſometimes ſomewhat leſs, even as here, a *dying* or *beſmearing*.) And accordingly the *Vulg. Lat.* doth not render it *intingite*, or *immergite in ſanguinem*, immerſe, or dip it into the blood, but *tingite ſanguine*, die, or beſmear it with blood.

§. 9. But if this inſtance be not clear enough and full enough (as to any reaſonable and modeſt Inquirer it may ſeem to be) there is another that probably is. In *Gen.* 37. we have the ſtory of *Joſeph*'s being ſold to the *Iſhmaelites* by his Brethren. Part of that ſtory is their contriving how to blind their Father, and make him believe his Son was torn in pieces by ſome evil Beaſt. In order unto that they *kill a Kid*, and *beſmear* the *Coat* with the *blood* thereof. We cannot imagine that the *Coat was bebloodied all over*, as it muſt have been, if it had been *totally immerſed* into blood. Nor would the crafty Brethren do ſo with it: for their fraud could not poſſibly, had they ſo done, have eſcaped diſcovery by their prudent Father. *So much* of it therefore only was *beſmeared with blood*, as might make it look like the Coat of one ſlain by a wild Beaſt, which would here *be bloody*, and there be without any tincture of blood, as the iſſues from the wounds ſhould diſperſe the tinctures, and not be bloody all over, like a Veſture dipt in blood. No total immerſion then of *Joſeph*'s Coat into the blood of the Kid, (if the blood of it ſaved at beſt advantage could

could be so much, as that the coat of a person so old, as *Joseph* then was, might be totally immersed into it:) there was but a *besmearing* of it, at most, by a partial mersation only into it. And accordingly the *Septuagint* render it by ἐμόλυναν, not they *dipped*, but *inquinârunt*, they *besmeared* it. And yet וַיִּטְבְּלוּ (*tinxerunt, intinxerunt*) formed from טָבַל is the original word, whereby the Author describes that action of *Josephs* brethren. So then the case seems clear, that טָבַל the word to which βαπτίζω answers in its signification, doth not necessarily import a *total immersion*; and therefore βαπτίζω doth not so neither.

§. 10. And what is said of the *Hebrew* טבל as to the comprehensiveness of its signification, the same is also said by the learned *Schindler* of the *Syriac* ܥܡܕ, which answers both to the *Hebrew* טבל and to the *Greek* βαπτίζεσθαι, namely that it signifies not only strictly *in aquam immersus fuit*, he was dipt into water, but also more generally *tinctus, & lotus fuit*, he was died, and washed. So that whether our Saviour spake *Hebrew*, or *Syriac*, the case is all one, the latter being of as great a latitude as the former.

Syr. ܥܡܕ *amad, baptizatus, in aquam immersus, tinctus, lotus fuit. ab Hebr.* עמד *stetit. stabant enim qui baptizabantur*, Schindler. *The son of* Azalkefat *in the* Arab. *Gospels useth the word* עמד Amada *to baptize; which also beareth the same sense in the* Syriac, *and is often mentioned by the Patriarch* Severus *in his* τάξις *or Order of* Baptizing *the Saints. The reason in both Dialects is the same, for that the word* Amada *is by the* Syrians *and* Arabians *derived from the* Hebrew *word* Amad, *which signifieth to* stand up. *J. G. on Sir* Tho. Ridleys *View of the Civil Law, p.* 176.

§. 11. And by this time, I hope, it sufficiently appears, that to *baptize*, though not by a *total immersion*, is not repugnant to the signification of βαπτίζοντες (our Saviours word in *Matth.* 28. 19.) but comprehended within the compass of it: and thence it will follow, that *such baptizing* as is not contrary to the word of Christ, is not contrary

to

to the will of Christ, but is consonant to his mind, and consistent with his will; and so a true, lawful, and *sufficient baptism*, though but by a partial mersation, an affusion, or aspersion. And the shewing of this was the first branch of my undertaking.

CHAP. VIII.

Βαπτίζω *not restrained to a total immersion amongst* Christians *by the practice of it among the* Jews.

§. 1. AND yet before I proceed to the Second, I meet with a Rub, which it may be convenient to remove out of the way. For it may be said, that though βαπτίζω may signifie in that latitude, that we contend for; yet the custome of that Time and Place, when and where our Saviour spake, was to *baptize by way of a total immersion*: and therefore his word ought to be understood with such restriction as is proper for that place and time; and so particularly of a *total dipping*.

§. 2. But to this (not to dispute the custom of that time and place) I answer, First, that our Lord Jesus Christ is in this concern to be considered as a *Legislator*, endued with power from him that sent him, both to reform old Laws, and change old customs, and to give new laws, and institute new customs: which power he asserts in the very next immediately foregoing words, saying, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* And as acting by that power he gives this Commission of *baptizing* to his Apostles, saying, *Go ye therefore, and teach all*

Ἐξουσία autem de quâ hîc (viz. Matth. 28. 18.) agitur, non significat illud δύναμα Dei, quod omnipotentiam vocamus, sed imperium regium, & autoritatem constituendi Ecclesiam per ministerium Apostolorum, de quo muncre regio vide Psal. 99. & 98. *Item* Matth. c. 11. & Joh. 13. *Tostat. Prælection. in* Matth. p. 383.

all Nations baptizing them. Whereupon it follows, that the Institutions, Laws, and Customs, appointed and ordained in, or brought into the Church by Christ, or those commissionated and empowered for that end by him, are not to be confined to, nor measured by, what was before, especially, if not infallibly of a *divine institution*, as the *total immersion* of *Proselytes*, (or even of *Natives*) whether for *admission into discipleship* to any Master, or for *entrance into the Community* of the Jewish people, or into the *Covenant of God*, can never be proved to be: but to be considered absolutely and independently as they are in themselves constituted by him, or by his appointment. And as, if his Laws and Constitutions do retrench any liberties, or enlargements that were given or permitted before, they are to be observed according to those restraints and retrenchments: So if his Laws and Constitutions do give a latitude, that was not before (as in the case of *meats* made lawful to be eaten under the Gospel, which were prohibited under the Law, *&c.*) in that latitude that he gives them, they are in all reason to be understood and observed. And consequently if βαπτίζω (his word) do signifie any thing else besides a *total immersion*, as a *partial mersation*, affusion, or aspersion, according to that latitude of its signification is his mind to be taken, and his precept expounded. For he hath the Key of *David*, and as well openeth, and no man shutteth, as shutteth, and no man openeth, *Rev.* 3. 7.

§. 3. Secondly, if our Saviour had designed strictly that way of a *total immersion*, used in the time and place when and where he spake these words, he could have used words of a lesser latitude than βαπτίζω, and which could not be capable of signifying any other way of baptizing, short of, or less than a total immersion: Such as καλαδύζω, καλαπονίζω, καταδύνω, or καταδύω, not to say δύπτω and βυθίζω. In that therefore he used a word of greater latitude than the then present use was, being no way in the least straitned for words, but having plenty at

at hand, to expres his mind in, had he pleased it should have been otherwise, it is plain he designed a greater latitude in the performance of that action, than justly agreed with the then present way *of baptizing* in that circumstance: and that according to that latitude we are to understand his mind in that word βαπτίζω.

§. 4. Thirdly, if our Saviour had designed the administration of this Sacrament only in that Nation, it had been reasonable to conceive his meaning was, that in the administration of it the custom of that nation should be observed, not only because it would well agree with the temperature of that country, but also because the customarines of it to another, yet very near, almost the same purpose, would make the reception of it unto his purpose the more easie to that people. But being he designed it to be the Ceremony of Initiation of disciples into his Church throughout *all nations*, it is most reasonable to believe his intendment was, that it should be administred in such a way as would best agree with the *temperature of all Countries*, and be most readily received by the people of all nations, either upon that account, or on any other of a near nature that might be customary among them (as among some of them there were used *purifications* by water in reference to divine service;) people being much more easily induced to admit of such Ceremonies and Customs, as are in some respect domestick and home, and they in part acquainted with, than those that are utterly foraign and wholly new. And according to what in reason we believe his real intendment to have been, in reason we are to understand his word to be meant. And then that must be not universally of a *total immersion*, but sometimes of *other*

Οὐκ ἀπεικότως ἄρα καὶ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο παρ' Ἕλλησιν ἄρχεται τοῖς καθάρσιοις, καθάπερ τοῖς βαρβάροις λουτροῖς. *Clem. Alex. Strom.* 5. *Nam & sacris quibusdam per lavacrum initiantur. Ipsidis alicujus aut Mithræ, ipsos etiam Deos suos lavationibus efferunt. Tertul. de Bapt. p.* 257. *Edit. Rigalt. Inter quæ* [*sc. Cereris sacra*] *præcipuum fuit, ut sacris initiatos, calda primùm abluerent* — *Alex. ab Alex. l.* 6. *c.* 19.

way

ways of baptizing: becauſe thoſe other ways are more agreeable to the temperature of ſome countries, than that is, and their receptions leſs liable to exception than that would have been.

§. 5. Fourthly, if our Saviour had deſigned this Sacrament to be adminiſtred only to perſons of *ſtrong conſtitution*, and in healthful ſtate, then in reaſon it might be believed, he intended its adminiſtration only in that way, which was in uſe in that Nation, and at that time, and was but ſuch as perſons in health and ſtrength might without danger endure, and without fear undergo. But ſeeing he intended it as an univerſal door for the letting in perſons of all eſtates, conditions, and conſtitutions, as well as Countries, into his Church (for he makes no *limitation* in that caſe, and the Churches practice hath ſo interpreted his precept) therefore it is moſt reaſonable to believe, he would, and did, deſign it ſo wide, as that it might give entrance unto all, and not by the ſtraitneſs of its ſeverity, and dangerouſneſs to the health and life of perſons of ſick, or ſickly, and weak condition and conſtitution, exclude any, eſpecially in *cold ſeaſons* and climates, and before the uſe of Fonts, when there were only rivers, or pools to baptize in. But that could not be by a total immerſion. Therefore he muſt in reaſon be believed to have intended it, when and where that could not be, by a partial merſation, affuſion or aſperſion, as the caſe and condition, the time, place, and perſon might require.

§. 6. If any more were needful I might in the Fifth place add, that βαπτίζω is ordinarily ſo uſed, as beſides the ſignification of an act of *application of water to the perſon baptized*, to conſignifie alſo all the other proper circumſtances of *baptizing*, both for matter and manner, that are omitted, where it is expreſſed: as for inſtance when 'tis ſaid of S. *Paul*, (*Act.* 9. 18.) *that he aroſe, and was baptized*, it is meant that none of the proper circumſtances of *baptiſm* were then

It is taken for the whole work and action of the Sacrament, *Matt.* 28. 19. Leigh. *Critic. Sacra.*

then omitted, though not one of them be expressed. So then our Saviour saying, *Go and make Heathens disciples baptizing them*, must be understood to mean, that all the proper circumstances of *baptism*, both in point of matter and form, must accompany that act. Now if the manner of baptizing at that time must determine our Saviours order to one circumstance, then, no discrimination being made, it must determine it to the others also, and so we must in all points be *baptized* as the *Jews* were; only in Rivers or Lakes: not in the night, nor on the Sabbath day, nor on any holy day; the party must first be put naked by others into the water, and there sit, or stand, up to the neck; he must there learn some precepts of the Law, hard as well as easie, and then he must at one plunge wholly *dip himself*, or be dipt by another. And now let our *Anabaptists* say in good earnest, whether they think all this should be punctually observed in *Christian baptism*; and therefore comprehended under our Saviours word βαπτίζοντες, because this was the manner of baptizing in that time and place, when and where our Saviour spake that word. I am of opinion they do not think so, because both the Apostles did, and the Church hath, and themselves do act differently in some respect from this manner and order. For the first company that ever the Apostles baptized after the sealing of their Commission to baptize with water, by their own being baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire, was on the day of Pentecost, an *holy day*. *Paul* and *Silas* baptized the Jaylor and his family in *the night*. And it has been the Churches practice in times of persecution to baptize in *the night*, and in latter times in *Fonts*, at first larger, after lesser, and for many ages by a *threefold immersion*. And as in the night the *Anabaptists* do, or (if they be now grown more confident,) have formerly baptized in the night, so their Proselytes, I suppose, are not *put into the water* by their Baptizer,

See Dr. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Matt.* 3. 6. *pag.* 45, *&c.*

zer, but go in of themſelves; neither (I think) are they now *naked*, but have ſome Linnen Garment on; neither do ſo much as the *Women dip themſelves*, but even they are dipped by their Baptizer, differently from the manner of baptizing in our Saviour's days. Then neither the Apoſtles did, nor the Church hath, nor themſelves do, think themſelves obliged by vertue of βαπτίζοντες, to conform in all points to the manner and order of baptizing in uſe, at that time, and in that place, where our Saviour ſpake that word. They then who cannot but ſee, that the Church of Chriſt hath varied, and who themſelves do vary in ſome circumſtances, from the manner and order uſed then and there, when and where our Saviour ſpake that word, cannot in reaſon, and ought not in juſtice, to tie us to the exact obſervation of others: unleſs they will be guilty of that high crime of uncharitableneſs, or rather injuſtice and partiality, which conſiſts in condemning others for what they do themſelves, *i. e.* varying from the order of baptizing in uſe, in that time and place, wherein our Saviour gave his order for baptizing: and then St. *Paul* will have ſomewhat to ſay to them, which I leave them to read, and conſider of, *Rom.* 2. 1, 2, 3, *&c.*

§. 7. And now ſuppoſing my way to be ſufficiently cleared by the removal of this obſtacle, I will proceed to that which is in order to follow.

CHAP. IX.

The agreeableneſs of baptizing by aſperſion or affuſion unto the Nature of Baptiſm.

§. 1. IF we inquire into the Nature of Baptiſm, we ſhall find it to be a holy Sacrament, wherein, by the external waſhing of the baptized with

Nam ad materiam quod attinet, aqua res eſt, ſeu nitro *plena eſſe*

with Water, is principally ſignified his inward waſhing from ſin by the blood of Chriſt: the water from the abundance of *nitre*, which is ſaid to be contained in it, and its being thereby made the more apt for cleanſing, very fitly repreſenting the blood of Chriſt, which (as the Apoſtle ſaith) *cleanſeth* from *all* ſin: and the action of waſhing no leſs fitly repreſenting the application of the blood of Chriſt to the ſinner for the cleanſing of him. In reference to which action the ſame Apoſtle hath told us of Chriſt's having loved us, and (as the beſt inſtance of that love imaginable) having waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood, *Rev.* 1. 5.

dicitur, ſeu quavis alia qualitate, omnium maximè idonea, quæ corporis ſordes eluat. Amyrald. Theſ. Salmur. De Bapt. Sect. 17. 1 Joh. 1. 7.

Nam ſicut aquâ abluuntur ſordes corporis, ſic ſanguine Chriſti in cruce effuſo & cordibus per fidem aſperſo abluuntur ſordes animæ, id eſt peccata. Piſcat. Com. Loc. 23. *Theſ.* 14. *Item Loc.* 24. *Theſ.* 12.

Baptiſmus *eſt Sacramentum à Chriſto inſtitutum, ut per illud Eccleſiæ inſeramur; cum hac promiſſione, quòd non minus certò quàm aquâ extrinſecùs lavamur, etiam intrinſecùs à peccatis abluimur per ſanguinem & Spiritum Chriſti. Voſſ. de Bapt. Diſp.* 1. *Theſ.* 3. *p.* 342.

Baptiſmus eſt primum N. T. Sacramentum, quo ex inſtitutione Chriſti per miniſtrum ejus aquâ alluimur in nomine Patris, Filii, & Spir. Sancti, ut ita Receptio in Novum Gratiæ Fœdus, & intrinſeca per ſanguinem & Spir. Chriſti ablutio à peccatis & clarè nobis ſignetur, & certò obſignetur. Id. ibid. p. 345.

§. 2. And hence the *Maſter of the Sentences* defining *Baptiſm* ſaith, it is an *intinction*, that is, an outward waſhing of the body, done under a preſcribed form of words. And later *Divines* define it to be a *Sacrament*, that by the *outward waſhing* of water, ſignifieth the *inward waſhing* of the Soul with the blood of Chriſt. It is ſaith *Altingius*, (a Learned Member of the Synod of *Dort*) the firſt Sacrament of the *New Teſtament* by

Baptiſmus dicitur intinctio, *i.e.* ablutio *corporis exterior facta ſub forma verborum præſcripta. P.* Lomb. *Sent. l.* 4. *Diſt.* 3. *part.* 1. *de Baptiſmo in ſpeciali.*

Baptiſmus eſt primum Sacramentum N. Teſtamenti per externam aquæ adſperſionem & ablutionem, declarans & obſignans fidelibus internam ipſorum ablutionem per

ſanguinem & ſpiritum Chriſti. H. Altting. *com. loc. Baptiſmus eſt prius novi Teſtamenti Sacramentum, quo qui in fœdere ſunt, à miniſtro Eccleſiæ ſecundum inſtitutionem Chriſti aquâ conſperguntur & abluuntur ad internam animæ à peccatis ablutionem, quæ ſpiritus ſancti operatione propter ſolum Chriſti ſanguinem contingit, nec non cum Chriſto communionem, & in Eccleſiæ Chriſti receptionem, ſignificandam, obſignandam, & conſerendam.* Wendelin. *Chriſt. Theolog. l. 1. c. 22. Theſ. 4. Baptiſmus eſt primum novi fœderis Sacramentum, in quo electis in Dei familiam receptis externâ aquæ aſperſione peccatorum remiſſio & regeneratio per ſanguinem Chriſti & ſpiritum ſanctum obſignatur.* Wolleb. *Chriſt. Theol. l. 1. c. 23. Baptiſmus eſt primum N. Fœderis Sacramentum à Chriſto inſtitutum ex analogis ſigno & ſignato & analogicâ relatione ipſorum inter ſe & actione conſtans, quo fœderati à Miniſtris Eccleſiæ abluuntur, ut Chriſto inſiti internæ animæ ablutionis per ſanguinem & ſpiritum ipſius fiant participes.* Luc. Trelcat. *Loc. Com. Inſtitut. l. 2. Tit. de Bapt. p. 187. Aqua aſſumitur in Sacramentum baptiſmi ad uſum ablutionis corporalis, per quam ſignificatur ablutio peccatorum.* Aquin. *Sum. 3. q. 66. art. 7. c. a. Quia tota virtus aquæ eſt in ſignificando per ablutionem, certè non intereſt quantum quiſque abluatur, quomodo in Euchariſtia quantum quiſque comedat.* Chamier *l. 5. de Baptiſm. c. 2. Notum eſt aquam, quæ eſt res permanens, non dici baptiſmum, nec Sacramentum Baptiſmi, ſed ablutionem, quæ eſt actio, dici Baptiſmum & Sacramentum Baptiſmi. —— Et ſimiliter certum eſt Sacramenti definitionem optimè congruere ablutioni, &c.* Bellarm. *de Sacram. Euch. l. 4. c. 2. Tom. 2. Col. 790. C D. Eſt hic baptiſmus, primum novi Teſtamenti Sacramentum à Chriſto inſtitutum, in quo apta & concinna ſigni & ſignati analogia, fœderati —— aquâ abluuntur ——* Tilen *Diſp. 1. de Bapt. Theſ. 4. Baptiſmus eſt Sacramentum N. T. quo aquæ perfuſione in nomine Patris, Filii & S. S facta ſignificatur & obſignatur fidelibus beneficium purgationis à peccato per filium Dei & regenerationis ad vitam æternam.* Keckermian. *Syſtem. Theolog. l. 3. c. 8. p. 451. ——*

the *external ſprinkling* and *waſhing of water*, declaring and ſealing unto believers their *inward waſhing* by the blood and ſpirit of Chriſt. So ſaith *Wendelinus* a later but no leſs Learned Divine than he, Baptiſm is the *former Sacrament* of the *New Teſtament*, wherein they, who are in the Covenant of God, are by a Miniſter of the Church, according to the Inſtitution of Chriſt, ſprinkled with water and waſhed, to ſignifie, ſeal, and confer the inward waſhing of the Soul from ſin. So others to the ſame purpoſe. *Voſſ. de Bapt. p. 345.*

§. 3. Hence

§. 3. Hence also among the *Fathers*; when they speak of the Sacrament of Baptism, we meet with frequent mentions [*lavandi, abluendi, diluendi, lavationis, lavacri*, &c.] of washing, cleansing, laver, *&c.* So saith St. *Hierom.* for indeed the water doth not wash the Soul, but first it self is washed by the Spirit, that it may be able spiritually to wash others. So *Tertullian*, Happy Sacrament of our water, wherewith we being washed from the delinquencies of our pristine blindness, are freed into eternal life. Again, we are not therefore washed to the end that we may leave sinning, but because we have left it, because we are in heart already washed. On supposition it were lawful for men to kill themselves, then saith St. *Aug.* were men rather to be exhorted to kill themselves, when being washed in the laver of holy regeneration, they shall have received the remission of all sins. And so others also speak.

Cur verò liquore corporis sordes abluente Sacramentum hoc perfici mandavit Jesus? in causâ est ἀναλογία inter ablutionem externam quæ Aquâ fit, & internam quæ fit sanguine & Spiritu Christi Voss. *de Bapt. Thes.* 4. *p.* 347.

Neque enim aquâ lavat animam, sed priùs ipsa lavatur spiritu, ut alios lavare spiritualiter possit. D. Hieron. *adv. Luciferian.* Felix *Sacramentum aquæ nostræ quâ abluti delictis pristinæ cæcitatis in vitam æternam liberamur.* Tertul. *de Bapt.*

Non ideo abluimur, ut delinquere desinamus, sed quia desiimus, quia jam corde loti sumus Id. ib. Nulla distinctio est mari quis an stagno, flumine an fonte, lacu an alveo diluatur. Id. ib. Hortandi sunt homines tunc se potiùs interimere, cùm lavacro sanctæ regenerationis abluti universorum remissionem ceperint peccatorum. D. Aug. *de Civ. l.* 1. *c.* 27. *Ablutos homines purgantibus undis Nomine sub sancto patris natique lavate.* Juven. *Lavamur igitur in baptismo, quia deletur chirographum damnationis nostræ, & gratia hæc nobis confertur, ne jam nobis concupiscentia noceat. si tamen à consensu abstineamus. D.* Bern. *Serm.* 1. *de Cœn. Dom. Divinæ autem gratiæ lavacrum, non corporis sed animæ maculam sordesque mundare consuevit. D.* Chrysost. *ad Baptizandos. Considerantes ac scientes, quòd templa dei sint membra vestra ab omni fæce contagionis antiquæ lavacri vitalis sanctificatione purgata. D.* Cyprian. *de Habit. Virg.* τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται. Just. Mart. 2. *Apolog.* Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λοῦσαι τὸν πεπεισμένον. *Id. ib.* ὁφωτιζόμενος λούεται. *Id. ib. Quanquam ad simplicem actum competat similitudo, ut quoniam vice sordium delictis inquinamur, aquis abluamur.*

abluamur. Tert. *de Bapt. Edit. Rigalt p.* 257. *Quid eſt baptiſmus Chriſti? lavacrum aquæ in verbo. D.* Aug. *Tract.* 15. *in Evang. Joh. In Chriſto igitur baptizari, ſignificat credentes in eum ablui.* Damaſc. *de Orthod. fid. l.* 4. *c.* 10. *fol.* 148. *a. Accepit rex Eduinus cum cunctis gentis ſuæ nobilibus ac plebe perplurima fidem & lavacrum ſanctæ regenerationis.* Beda. *Eccleſ. Hiſt. Ang. l.* 2. *c.* 14.— *A manè ad veſperam nihil aliud ageret, quàm confluentem eò de cunctis viculis ac locis plebem, Chriſti verbo ſalutis inſtruere, atque inſtructam in fluvio Gleni, qui proximus erat, lavacro remiſſionis ablucre. Id. ib. Quid eſt baptiſmus Chriſti? Lavacrum aquæ in verbo. Id. in Epheſ.* 5. *fol.* 234. *E. Si vultis ablui fonte illo ſalutari, quo pater veſter ablutus eſt, poteſtis etiam panis ſancti, cui ille participabat, eſſe participes. Sin autem lavacrum vitæ contemnitis, nullatenus valetis panem vitæ percipere. Bed. Ec. Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *fol.* 63.

Ecce venturi eſtis ad fontem ſanctum, dilucmini baptiſmo, ſalutari lavacro regenerationis renovabimini: critis ſine ullo peccato, aſcendentes de illo lavacro: omnia quæ vos peccata perſequebantur ibi delebuntur. D. Aug. *Serm.* 119. *de Temp. Cùm de illo ſanctiſſimo lavacro novi natalis aſcenditis.* Tertul.

§. 4. And from hence it is, that even the very Font it ſelf, wherein men are by that Sacrament cleanſed from the filth of their birth and life, hath the name of *laver* given unto it. *When ye go up out of that laver,* (ſaith S. *Aug.*) *ye ſhall be without all ſin.* And ſo *Tertul.* When ye aſcend out of that moſt holy *laver* of the New birth--- And ſo others.

Λυσόμενον ἀγοντες ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρὸν--- Juſt. Martyr. *Apol.* 2.

§. 5. And no wonder, when under ſuch like words as theſe is this holy Sacrament propoſed in ſeveral places of the Sacred Scriptures. It is called by S. *Paul* (*Tit.* 3. 5.) λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, *i. e.* (as St. *Hier.* tranſlates it) *lavacrum regenerationis*; (as we) the *waſhing of regeneration.* The ſame St. *Paul* writing to the *Corinthians* ſaith to and of them (1 *Cor.* 6. 11.) *And ſuch* (*viz.* as thoſe were, whom he had reckoned up in the two foregoing verſes,) *were ſome of you,* but ἀπελούσασθε *ye are* (or ye have been) *waſhed, but ye are ſanctified, but ye are juſtified, in the name of our Lord Jeſus, and by the Spirit of our God, i. e.* ye have been waſhed in baptiſm, ſanctified by

by the Spirit of our God, and juſtified in, or by the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Again ſaith he to the. *Epheſians* (*c.* 5. *v.* 25, 26.) *Husbands love your wives even as Chriſt alſo loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it, That he might ſanctifie and cleanſe it,* λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι [*lavacro aquæ in verbo,* as *Vulg. Lat.* renders it, that is, as *we*] *with the waſhing of water by the word,* that is, in or by *Baptiſm.* And in theſe his expreſſions to others, he ſpeaks but ſuitably to what had by another been ſpoken to himſelf, even by *Ananias,* who, as it were to intimate unto him, that the nature of *Baptiſm* did principally conſiſt in the waſhing of man from the guilt and ſtain of ſin, mentions that, and nothing elſe but that, as the deſign of it, when he exhorts him to be baptized. *And now* (ſaith he, *Act.* 22. 16.) *why tarrieſt thou? Ariſe, and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the name of the Lord.* Much after the rate of St. *Peters* exhortation to the converted Jews (*Act.* 2. 38.) *to repent and be baptized in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins;* promiſing therewithal, as an inducement thereunto, *their receiving the gift of the Holy Ghoſt.*

§. 6. By all which it appears, that as well in the judgment of *Ancient,* as of *Modern* Divines, and even by Scripture Text it ſelf, as *water* is a ſuitable element to repreſent the *blood* of Chriſt, whereby we are cleanſed from our ſins, ſo *waſhing* with water is a ſuitable action, whereby the *application* of *Chriſts Blood* unto us for our *cleanſing* is expreſſed, and ſo moſt agreeable unto the nature of *Baptiſm*; and conſequently, that by what application of water we may be ſo waſhed as to be cleanſed, by ſuch we may be ſaid to be baptized.

---Aquæ proprietates in eluendis corporibus vim ſanguinis Chriſti in delendis peccatis--- declarant. Tilen. *Diſp.* 1. *de Bapt. Theſ.* 32.

— Cùm nec minùs in aſperſione quàm in immerſione, Sacramenti analogia ſervetur; ſiquidem in legalibus purificationibus ſufficiebant ῥαντισμοί. Tilen. *Diſp. 1. de Bapt. Theſ. 15. — Præſertim cùm ἀναλογία ſignificationis maneat, & adſperſione illæ etiam ſordes abluantur.* — Keckerman *Theol. Syſtem. l 3. c. 8. p. 452.*

§. 7. Now that *ſprinkling* is ſuch a way of *application of water*, as hath been deſigned and uſed for cleanſing, will appear from Scripture, and then conſequently it will follow, that it may be ſo ſtill. And of that we have inſtance in *Num.* 8. 5, 6, 7. where the Lord gives order unto *Moſes* to cleanſe the *Levites*, and directs him too how to cleanſe them. *And thus* (ſaith he) *ſhalt thou do unto them to cleanſe them: ſprinkle water of purifying upon them, and let them ſhave all their fleſh, and let them waſh their clothes, and ſo make themſelves clean.* See! here is no other waſhing of them appointed for their cleanſing, but what was done by ſprinkling of the water of purification upon them. In *Num.* 19. order is given for making *water of ſeparation* with the aſhes of a red Heifer, *ver.* 1, *&c.* This water was to be a purification for ſin, *v.* 10. The way of waſhing with this water for purification was to be by way of *ſprinkling*; and that ſo ſtrictly, that whoſoever had touched the body of a dead man, and had not ſo purified himſelf with it, was to be cut off from *Iſrael*, *becauſe the water of purification had not been ſprinkled upon him*, *v.* 13. So again for the *purifying* of a *Tent* wherein any Man died, and of the perſons and veſſels in it, or any that touched any of them, a *purification* was ordained to be made by this water; and that purification was to be made by *ſprinkling*; *v.* 18, 19. with the like menace of *cutting off* from the Congregation to him that was unclean on thoſe accounts, and had not ſo purified himſelf: *becauſe he hath defiled the Sanctuary of the Lord, the water of purification hath not been ſprinkled upon him*, *ver.* 20. Which cleanſing from the Legal pollution of the body, by the ſprinkling of the water of purification, *typified* our cleanſing from the moral defilement of the Soul, by the ſprinkling of the blood of Chriſt.

Chriſt. Whereto the Learned Dr. *Jackſon* ſaith, the Apoſtle hath ſpecial *reference*, more than *alluſion*, ſaying, Heb. 9. 13, 14. *If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the aſhes of an heifer ſprinkling the unclean ſanctifieth to the purifying of the fleſh, How much more ſhall the blood of Chriſt purge your conſcience from dead works?* And again, that the water of ſprinkling, conſecrated by the *aſperſion of the aſhes* of this legal ſacrifice, did truly reſemble the water of *Baptiſm*, by which we are waſhed from ſin, and conſecrated unto God as clean perſons, that is, made Members of his Church on Earth (ſaith he) is ſo evident in it ſelf, that it needs no Paraphraſe or laborious Comment upon the forecited Law; yet withal referring his Reader to *Chytræus* his Commentaries on the Book of *Numbers*, &c. And I ſhall not be alone, if I ſhall ſay, that the Apoſtle hath a reſpect unto Baptiſm, when in *Heb.* 10. 22. he ſaith, *Let us draw near with a true heart in full aſſurance of faith, having our hearts ſprinkled from an evil conſcience*, and *our bodies waſhed with pure water*. Which words [*having our hearts ſprinkled*, &c.] to me ſeem not ſo much to declare with what *qualification* we ſhould draw near unto God, as upon what *ground* we may draw near unto him; even upon the account of our having been baptized, and therein had our hearts ſprinkled from an evil conſcience with the blood of Chriſt, as well as our bodies waſhed with the pure water of *Baptiſm*. And to this ſenſe the Original fairly leads, Προσερχώμεθα, &c. ἐῤῥαντισμένοι --- καὶ λελουμένοι, that is literally, being we have had our *hearts ſprinkled* from an evil conſcience, and

Tom. 3. *Lib.* 10. *c.* 50. *Sect.* 3. *p.* 271.

Ad Sacramentum enim Baptiſmi Apoſtolus reſpicere videtur, quo externa *quidem* corporum fit ablutio, interna vero cordium purgatio *per Chriſti ſanguinem* obſignatur. *D.* Parcus *in Heb.* 10. 22.

Eſt ergo ſenſus: Cùm ſanguine & ſpiritu Chriſti *à ſordibus peccati purgati ſimus, hujuſque purgationis ſymbolum baptiſmum habeamus, accedamus igitur purificatis cordibus per fidem, non polluti peccatis conſcientiam turbantibus per veram reſipiſcentiam.* Par. *in loc.*

have had our *bodies waſhed* with pure water, that is, being we have been *baptized*, and ſo purged and cleanſed (from thoſe ſins, which before kept us at a diſtance from God, and made us afraid to come nigh him) by the blood and ſpirit of Chriſt, who is our High Prieſt, and is at the right hand of God interceding for us, let us with a true heart draw near to God, in confidence of acceptance through his Interceſſion for us, who by ſo purging and cleanſing us hath fitted us for ſuch acceſs, in full aſſurance of faith, that upon our approaching we ſhall be accepted. And when the *inward waſhing* from ſin is ſtiled a *ſprinkling*, how fairly doth it intimate, that the *outward waſhing* did hold correſpondence with it, and was performed by *ſprinkling* alſo? At leaſt ſo much will be infallibly gained by it, that *waſhing* by way of *ſprinkling*, is an action very ſuitable to, and agreeable with, the *nature of baptiſm*, as outwardly repreſenting that inward waſhing, which is performed therein, and correſpondently thereunto termed a *ſprinkling*.

§. 8. And even God himſelf had long before ſhewed the agreeableneſs of the *outward waſhing* of the body from its *filths* with water by way of *ſprinkling*, with the *inward waſhing* of the Soul from its ſins by his grace through the blood of Chriſt applied thereto for its cleanſing, when (in *Ezech.* 36. 5.) he ſaid to *Iſrael*, in reference to their defilements wherewith they had been defiled in the Countries into which they had been ſcattered, *Then will I ſprinkle clean water upon you, and you ſhall be clean, from all your filthineſs, and from all your Idols will I cleanſe you*: That is, I will render you as ſpiritually clean from your ſin, by my pardoning and purifying grace, as you ſhould be legally clean, by having clean water, even the *water of ſeparation* and *purification*, *ſprinkled* upon you.

§. 9. And if the *blood of Sacrifices* may be thought to have a nearer reſemblance with the blood of Chriſt, than water hath, yet as the application of Chriſt's blood to our Souls for the cleanſing of them, is ſet forth by way of

ſprinkling,

ſprinkling, whence his blood is called αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, the blood of ſprinkling, *Heb.* 12. 24. ſo the *application of the blood of Sacrifices* for cleanſing, was moſtly made by *ſprinkling*: whence the Apoſtle (*Heb.* 9. 21, 22.) ſaith of *Moſes*, that *he ſprinkled with blood both the Tabernacle, and all the Veſſels of the Miniſtry.* And that *almoſt all things are by the Law purged with blood.* Thence we read of a *Ram* that was to be ſlain at the conſecration of *Aaron*'s Sons, and his blood to be *ſprinkled* round about upon the Altar, *Exod.* 29. 16. When a Bullock was to be offered for a burnt Sacrifice by any of the People, in order to an atonement to be made for him, the Sons of *Aaron* were to bring the blood, and *ſprinkle* the blood round about upon the Altar, *Levit.* 15. and ſo if it were of the Flocks, *ib.* v. 11. So if it were a Peace-offering, *Levit.* 3. 8, 13. So alſo if it were a Treſpaſs-offering, *Levit.* 7. 2. So if it were a Sin-offering to be offered by the High-Prieſt for himſelf and for his Houſe, the blood of it was to be *ſprinkled* ſeven times upon the Mercy-ſeat, and before the Mercy-ſeat, *Levit.* 16. 14. And the like was to be done if it were for the People, (*ib.* v. 15.) and that in order to the making an atonement for the *holy place*, becauſe of the uncleanneſs of the Children of *Iſrael*, and becauſe of their tranſgreſſions in all their ſins. (*ib.* v. 16.) And if the ſin for which the Sacrifice was to be offered, whether of the Prieſts, or of the Peoples, were a ſin of ignorance, the blood of it was to be *ſprinkled* ſeven times before the Lord, *Levit.* 4. 6, 17. Even whatſoever it was, Ox, Lamb, or Goat, that was to be ſacrificed, ſo was his blood to be diſpoſed of, *Levit.* 17.

See Dr. Ham. *in loc.*

§. 10. If then the *application* of that which *typified* the *blood* of Chriſt, (whether it were *water* or *blood*) before the *ſhedding* of it, was conveniently made (and who dares queſtion the conveniency of it, ſince it was by God's appointing to be made?) by *ſprinkling*, how can then the *application of water* in *baptiſm* by *ſprinkling* (whereby the waſhing

waſhing of our Souls from ſins, and the cleanſing of our Conſciences from defilements by the *blood* of Chriſt (that *blood of ſprinkling*) now that it is ſhed, is repreſented and ſignified) be any other but a moſt agreeable action, and the party to whom it is ſo applied be moſt truly ſaid to be *baptized*? And the remonſtrating of this is the diſcharge of the Second part of my undertaking.

§. 11. The Third, whereto I ſhall now advance, is the ſhewing of the agreeableneſs of baptizing by other ways than a *total immerſion*, with the Practice of the Church.

CHAP. X.

Other ways of baptizing beſides that of a total immerſion *uſed in the Church, in all, or moſt Ages and Places of it.*

§. 1. LET no Man think here that I intend to demonſtrate *ſprinkling*, or any other way of *baptizing*, leſs than a *total immerſion*, to have been either *the only*, or *the moſt general way* of adminiſtring that Sacrament. I am too well aſſured, by a multitude of evidences, of the contrary thereunto to undertake that. But this is that which I deſign to evince, that how general ſoever the way of *baptizing* by a *total dipping* may by ſome be imagined to be (and perhaps that may in the iſſue appear not to have been ſo general, as it is by them imagined) yet it was *not* the *only way*, but a *baptiſm* by *aſperſion*, *affuſion*, *tinging* or *wetting* with water, or however by a *partial merſation*, has been practiſed in the Church from the Primitive to the preſent times: whereof I ſhall give either real demonſtrations, or probable arguments, in all, or moſt of the Ages

§. 2. For

§ 2. For the firſt Age, to begin with that, there were few, except the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts*, that writ any thing: and of what they wrote little is left; and of that little, nothing, that I know of, concerns the queſtion in hand. The Reaſon may well be conceived to have been, becauſe it then was no queſtion; and the rather becauſe we find the Practice, we contend for, in being, in after Ages; which is a fair inducement to believe it to have been derived from thence to them, unleſs it could be certainly told when, where, and by whom, it was afterward firſt introduced into the Church. Our Intelligence then muſt be fetcht (for this Age) all from the *Holy Scriptures*. And there alſo things do not appear with ſo bright a light, as to force a conviction upon a prejudiced or prepoſſeſſed underſtanding: but after all that can be ſaid, contrary minded perſons, if of ſtubborn temper, may think themſelves to have ſufficient matter, whereon to ground a contradiction. What *probabilities* then, (and I will not pretend to more than a *probability*) of ſuch a practice in the *Apoſtles Age*, as I have either conceived of my ſelf, or received from others, I will here fairly communicate, and then leave the Reader to make his judgment upon the matter; only deſiring him in the mean time to have an eye on St. *Auguſtin*'s judgment touching ſuch *immemorial uſages*, as the *Catholick Church* holds, and ever hath held, and have not come into uſe by the *inſtitution of any Council*, that they are rightly believed to have been delivered down to it by no leſs than an *Authority Apoſtolical*.

Quod univerſa *tenet* Eccleſia, *nec Conciliis inſtitutum, ſed ſemper retentum eſt, non niſi* Authoritate Apoſtolicâ *traditum rectiſſimè creditur. D* Aug. *de Bapt. contr. Donat. l.* 4. *c.* 24.

§. 3. And I begin with the *Baptiſm* of thoſe *firſt Converts* that the *Apoſtles* did, after the ſealing of their *Commiſſion* by the *deſcent of the Spirit* upon them, admit into the Church by that Ceremony. Upon the day of *Penteceſt* St. *Peter* preach'd to a great, but confuſed multitude. By his Sermon *thouſands were converted*; and of thoſe Converts,

verts, whatever were afterward, no fewer, as is conceived, than *three thousand* were the same day *baptized*. The question here is in what way they were baptized; whether by *immersion*, or by aspersion. And the improbabilities of the former have made learned persons to conceive it was by the latter. It is not likely (saith *Zanchie*) that they were baptized any other way than by *sprinkling*. And it is very like, saith *Lynwood*, that the Apostle S. *Peter* baptized, not by way of *immersion*, but of *aspersion*, who at one Sermon converted *three*, and at another *five thousand* Souls; for the baptizing of all whom, and by way of *immersion*, I suppose he thought him insufficient, as he might well do. The bare but pronouncing of the *form* of words, which the Learned generally judge were *prescribed by our Saviour* to be used in *baptizing*, so many thousand times over (unless he used a *plural form*, of which yet there is no appearance, and the *singular* is more *applicative*, and *affecting*) had been enough to have tired one man; much more that, and the action of putting so many persons all wholly under the water.

Confirmatur exemplo Petri *in Actis, cap.* 2. *qui statim post* concionem *legitur baptizâsse* 3000. *Baptizati (inquit* Lucas, *nempe per* Petrum, *ut Interpretes exponunt) fuerunt. Non videtur autem verisimile fuisse aliâ ratione* baptizatos, *quàm* aspersione aquæ. *Hier. Zanch. de cultu dei externo, l.* 1. *col.* 494. *Et verisimile est quòd non per modum* immersionis, *sed* aspersionis *baptizaverit Apostolus* Petrus, *ad cujus prædicationem legitur unâ die quinque millia, & aliâ die tria millia conversos ad fidem baptizâsse.* Lynwood. *l.* 3. *de Bapt. Quod in constitut. ad verb.* immersio.

§. 4. But it is not said in the Text, that *He alone*, or that he at all baptized them: only that they were baptized. But it is rationally supposable, that as our Saviour had joyned the rest of the Apostles in Commission with him, and had sealed that Commission to them by the *descent of the Holy Ghost*, as well as to him; and that as they stood up with him, as vouchers of what he would say, when he began to preach, so they assisted him in the action, when he

he began to Baptize. But ſtill what are *eleven* or *twelve* men to the baptizing of *three thouſand* by way of *total immerſion*? How long muſt *every man* be in *baptizing* his *two hundred and fifty* men? For ſo many muſt every man have to *baptize*, if the number were equally ſhared amongſt them; nay more when *five thouſand* were at once converted, and as 'tis probable, *baptized* alſo, though it be not expreſſed.

Quum enim plura nonnunquam millia hominum uno die baptizari neceſſe habuerint, veriſimile non eſt homines in Evangelii prædicatione occupatos tantæ rei & tam operoſæ ſuppeditare potuiſſe. Amyrald. Theſ. Salm. de Bapt. Sect. 20.

§. 5. Yet ſuppoſing this not only poſſible but eaſie alſo, eſpecially by the aſſiſtance of *other diſciples*, and particularly the *Seventy* whom our Saviour had before in his life ſent out to preach, and who may, perhaps not improbably, be conceived to have been with them at this time, and *aſſiſtant to them* in this action, yet where would they in *Jeruſalem* have a *water deep* enough, and *wide* enough for the performance of ſuch an action? Aſſuredly on this account, that they could not there have water for it, doth *Bonaventure* ground his Argument that they baptized not by *dipping*, but by *ſprinkling*. And that they could not have it is probable, becauſe we read of *no river* that was in *Jeruſalem*, of that *depth* that men might be *totally immerſed* in it, whether they ſtood, or but ſo much as ſate in the water, when they were baptized. And for the *pool of Bethesda*, if that may be conceived to be the place, it is hardly probable (if it were of that *deepneſs*) that it was of that *capaciouſneſs* to afford room in any reaſonable time for the baptizing of *three* (much leſs of *five*) *thouſand* men. And that it did not afford that conveniency, either upon account of the incapaciouſneſs of it, or of ſome other uſe of it (as to waſh the entrails of

Apoſtoli baptizaverunt tria millia hominum unâ die. & conſtat quòd non mergendo, quia non haberent aquam: ergo aſpergendo. ſed aſpergi non poteſt totus homo. Ergo. Bonaventur. in l. 4. ſent. diſt. 3. ar. 3. q. 2.

Beaſts

Beasts offered in Sacrifice, *&c.*) rendring it unfit for that people so studious of cleanness (even to a superstitiousness) to immerse themselves in it, is probable, because when *John* baptized, it is said *there went out unto him all the land of* Judea, *and they of* Jerusalem, *and were all baptized of him in the river of* Jordan (St. *Mark* 1. 5.) which had been needless had there been conveniency for their baptizing at home. And when it is said that *John* was baptizing in *Ænon*, because there was *much water* there, (*Joh.* 3. 23.) it intimates a want of that conveniency in other places of *Judea*, and particularly in *Jerusalem* it self, for them of that place to be baptized in; where doubtless else he would have chosen to have *baptized* as most conducing to the purpose he came about, and baptized for, had there been in it that conveniency for it. And if there were not conveniency for the *baptizing* of such numbers in the City, since we read not of their going out of the City to be baptized elsewhere, in all probability they were baptized in such a way, as suited with the circumstance of the place they were in; and then it must be by *aspersion* or *affusion*; since there was not conveniency in the City for their *total immersion*.

§. 6. And yet still supposing the *Baptizers* never *so many*, and the *waters* there never so *plentiful*, their baptizing by a *total immersion* is very *improbable*. For it must needs be granted, that it was a *tumultuary* convention, which the *Apostle* preached unto, which suddenly came together, upon the noise of what had befallen the Apostles, upon the *descent of the Holy Ghost* upon them. And it will not, I think, be denied that it was a *confused multitude*, a mixture of people of different *Sexes*, and ages, as well as conditions and countries. Now, not to note how strange a thing it would look like, to see *three thousand* people going all in a throng to a pool, to be all *dowsed*, and *stark naked* (as the manner then was) *over head and ears* there (and even the women, in their nakedness, by men, *no deaconesses* being as yet ordained in the Christian Church for that purpose)

purpoſe) how unimaginable is it, that the modeſty of many of the *male Sex*, and moſt, if not all, of the *female Sex*, ſhould not ſtart back, and recoile from ſo *undecent* and *unbecoming* an action; an action even for the heavens to have bluſhed at, as well as for the earth to be aſhamed of. And ſtill the more unimaginable it will appear, when it is remembred with how great a reſpect unto *female modeſty* Baptiſm (as *Maimonides* tells us) was among the Jews adminiſtred to the *feminine Proſelytes*; the *woman* being ſet by women in the water up to the neck; and two diſciples of the wiſe ſtanding at ſome diſtance and teaching her, as ſhe ſtood, ſome eaſie, and ſome harder precepts of the Law; which done ſhe dipped her ſelf, and they whilſt ſhe came up out of the water, turned their faces another way, and departed. *Men* (I ſay) and *Women*, and ſo many of them, and in the midſt of a *populous City*, and at *noon-day*, goirg all together into a Pool, and there *dipped ſtark naked* (for none can imagine, that, either they would be dipped all over in their preſent wearing apparel, or (if that were allowable, as it was not uſual among the Jews) that they had brought any Garments with them ſuitable to the action, on that ſuddain and unexpected, unforeſeen, and unforethought of occaſion) is a thing ſo far *beyond all probability* as to be without the bounds even of all *credibility*. And eſpecially when it may be conſidered, that there was no neceſſity (the excuſe many times of indecent actions) for it: a much eaſier, and more decent way of baptizing being to be had, even by *immerſing* their heads into veſſels of water, with much facility, eſpecially by the hands of ſo many aſſiſtants as were upon the place ready thereunto, brought thither for that purpoſe; or elſe by taking water out thence as we do now

Fœminam fœminæ ſiſtunt in aquis, collo tenus: duoq; diſcipuli ſapientum, ab extra ſtantes, edoceat eam de quibuſdam levioribus præceptis legis, quibuſdamq; gravioribus, dum ea interea ſtat in aquis: & tum immergit ea ſeipſam: atque illi averſâ facie excunt, dum aſcendit ex aquâ. vid. Lightfoot. *Hor. Hebr. in Mat. c. 3. v. 6. p. 46, 47.*

now out of our Fonts, and *ſprinkling* them with it, or pouring it upon them: or yet elſe, if the action muſt needs be done at a Pool or River, by diſperſing themſelves in ſeveral companies: ſome to that Pool, others to ſeveral parts of the Brook *Cedron*, or ſuch other places of conveniency as the City might afford, and there either *ſprinkling* or *pouring water* upon them, or elſe *immerſing their heads* into water: which might well enough be done without a neceſſity of that *immodeſt way of putting off all their clothes*, and appearing ſtark naked in mixed company. And now let the unbiaſſed Reader judge, what probability there is of their being *totally dipped*: and how far it is from being improbable, that they were otherwiſe baptized.

§. 7. I proceed to another inſtance, *viz.* the Baptiſm of St. *Paul* himſelf, *Act.* 9. He had ſeen a Viſion by the way from *Jeruſalem* to *Damaſcus*: and that an aſtoniſhing one; ſuch an one as made him *fall to the earth*, *v.* 4. ſuch a ſight as made him *blind*, *v.* 8. Upon that he was led to the City, and there, whether in that Conſternation, or other Prophetick rapture, or Penitential exerciſe of Mortification, he continued three days, and did neither eat nor drink. After three days comes *Ananias* ſent from God unto him, opens his eyes, declares unto him the deſign of God in this diſpenſation, exhorts him to ariſe, and be *baptized* in order to his further adaptment for the Service whereto God had deſigned him. He comports with the Will of God, and aroſe, and was Baptized. But how? By a *total immerſion* of him? That is not ſaid. Nor is it in the leaſt probable. Firſt conſider the time of the year when it is ſuppoſed to have been done; on *the five and twentieth day of January*, the ſterneſt and ſevereſt Seaſon of all that cold Winter quarter. Then conſider the weakneſs of the Perſon, a man firſt ſo enfeebled by an extraordinary Viſion, that he was not able to go or ſtand, but fell to the earth, and was fain to be led by others: and then continuing after it three whole days together without

eating

eating or drinking. Thirdly, conſider that his *baptizing* was in the time of his weakneſs, and before he had received any meat to get ſtrength. *v.* 18, 19. And now after all this, let the impartial Reader judge, what probability there is in it, or rather how utterly improbable it is, that under thoſe circumſtances he was baptized by a total immerſion; and how much more probable it is, that water was brought to him that was not able to go to it; and he more gently aſperſed with it, that was too weak to endure the ſeverity of a total immerſion into it; or yet that, if there were any dipping in the caſe, it was but his head, or perhaps no more than his face, that was dipped: and how far after Ages are from being to blame in conſulting the healths and lives of their weak Infants at their baptizing, by only aſperſing or affuſing water on them, when they ſee in the Word of God ſuch great probabilities of this dear choſen Veſſel's being ſo baptized.

§. 8. There is a Third inſtance looking this way in *Act.* 10. I cannot pretend to a certainty from thence, more than from any other place; only (methinks) there is ſomething of probability of a *baptiſm* by *aſperſion* in it, and no certainty of a *total immerſion*, more than can be drawn from the bare ſignification of the word βαπτίζω, which we have long ſince ſhewn to have no ſuch cogency in it that way, as neceſſarily to infer a *total immerſion* of the party to whom it is applied, where-ever it is uſed. St *Peter* being ſent for by *Cornelius* to *Cæſaria*, and being authorized by a Viſion to go to him upon his ſending, immediately after he was come, preached the Goſpel to him, and his company. Whileſt he was preaching, the *Holy Ghoſt* fell on all them which heard the Word. (*v.* 44.) St *Peter* ſeeing them thus *baptized* before-hand with the *Spirit*, concluded it but fitting that they, though *Gentiles*, ſhould be alſo *baptized with water*, (v. 47.) and thereupon commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord. (*v.* 48.) And though their *baptizing* be not expreſſed, yet it is but rational to conceive they were *baptized*. By the laſt words

in the Chapter, which expreſs their deſiring of him then to tarry certain days, it ſeems as if they had not gone out of his preſence, but had continued with him all the time of their *baptizing*, which was performed betwixt his commanding them to be baptized, and their deſiring him to tarry. Then they went not out of the Houſe; then the inconveniencies of a *total immerſion* incline to believe the *baptizing* was by a way of leſs inconveniency: eſpecially when the Apoſtle's manner of expreſſion, when he argues from their inward *baptiſm* to their right unto an outward baptizing, is conſidered. (*v.* 47.) *Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* He doth not ſay, can any Man forbid them (we may ſuppoſe) going abroad to the water to be baptized therein? but, can any Man *forbid water* (we may ſuppoſe) to be brought hither, that they may be *baptized* therewith? As if he had ſaid, The *Holy Ghoſt* having in this place already begun, and done his part of *baptiſm* in falling upon them, it is but convenient that in the ſame place we ſhould do our part, and *baptize them with water* alſo; that ſo they may not go away with a *half baptiſm*, but have their baptiſm completed. Therefore let even ſome water be brought hither, and let them be ſealed with the outward affuſions of that upon their bodies, who are already ſealed with the inward effuſions of the Spirit upon their Souls. I cannot, I ſay, pretend hence invincibly to prove they were not dipped: but how probable it is they were only ſprinkled, I leave to the conſideration, and reſolution of the calm and unprejudicated Reader.

§. 9. There is a Fourth inſtance, (in *Act.* 16.) wherein is no leſs, if not a greater probability of a baptiſm by *aſperſion*, than in this. At *Philippi* St. *Paul* and *Silas* being apprehended and beaten, are thruſt into the inner Priſon, and have their Feet made faſt in the Stocks. At Midnight there is an Earth-quake, the Priſon doors are opened, and the Priſoners bands looſed. The *Jaylor* ſeeing

ing what was done, is affrighted; asks *Paul* and *Silas*, what he ſhould do to be ſaved? They preach the word of the Lord to him, and to all that were in his Houſe. By their preaching he and his (all that were capable of underſtanding and believing) are converted. Upon his converſion he becomes as kind to them, as before he had been cruel. And remembring the ſeverity of the ſtripes he gave them, he applies water for the waſhing away of the blood he drew from them. And at the ſame time is *baptized* both he himſelf, and all his. *Baptized?* Yes: that he was. But how! By *dipping?* or *ſprinkling?* or other application of water, leſs than a *total immerſion?* The Text ſays it not: it ſpeaks nothing more than that he was *baptized*. We are wholly left then to conjecture. What ſhould incline us to think of a *total immerſion* here? There is no mention of their going from the Priſon to any River or Pool to dip them there. Nor is there, though *Grotius* conjecture it, any mention of any *Pool*, that was within the precincts of the Priſon, wherein they might be *dipped*. Nor was there any need of it: leſs water than a Pool would ſerve to waſh their ſtripes; and another kind of waſhing, than that of dipping was more proper for that purpoſe. One would think a gentle bathing, and wiping off the blood, with a ſoft cloth, or a tender hand, the moſt proper action in that caſe. Let us but conſult what we our ſelves would do in the like concern, and our reaſon will do us right in it. No probability then of his going to dip them, but only of his calling for water to waſh them. And then as little probability of their carrying him, and all his Family too, any whither elſe, in a ſtrange place, and at *mid night* too, to *dip* them. All that can be imagined fairly, and without a violent detortion in this caſe is but this; that finding him to be a believer, the *Apoſtles* took the opportunity of his bringing water for the waſhing of their bodies, to make uſe

Item multi (ſc. baptizati) in domibus privatis, Act. 16. & 18. 1 Cor. 1. 16. *ubi ingreſſus ejuſmodi in aquas vix eſſe potuit.* Walæus *Synopſ. Theolog. Furior. Diſp.* 44. *Theſ.* 19. *p.* 606.

of that water for the washing of his *Soul*, cleansing him from the stains of his sins, as he had cleansed them from the maculations of their stripes, by as gently bathing him from the one, as he had bathed them from the other. And now let the unbiassed, and unpassionate Reader coolly judge, in whether Opinion is the greater probability, that, which is for his *total immersion*, or that, which is for some milder way of *baptization*; there being pleadable, as on the one side no necessity; so on the other great conveniency.

§. 10. There is yet one instance more that may be insisted on, which, were it clear beyond exception, would be of mighty concernment in the case, even so far as to have the casting voice in the debate. But it is liable to exception: and therefore I shall only propose it as disputable, and leave the Reader, after all, to make what estimate he pleases of it, according to those degrees of probability, or improbability, that shall appear to him to be in it, yet not altogether without hope, but that, when what is said, for, and against it, shall be dispassionately considered, it may, to modest and sober inquirers, prove convincing and satisfactory. It is the Example of our Saviour: whose baptism to have been, according to the manifold usual representations of it in picture, by an infusion of water upon him, and particularly on his head, and that by the right hand of the Baptist, St. *Bernard* is most express and positive in. *Infundit aquam capiti creatoris creatura*, saith he, That very Noble Creature (meaning *John* the Baptist) *poureth* water on the head of his Creator; and the right hand of a Man, handles and toucheth the Head of a God. A clear and full instance, if it hold good.

Exuitur vestimentis rex gloriæ, splendor luminis, & figura substantiæ dei. Foannis manibus attrectatur caro illa desumpta de virgine, candidiorique derivata materia nudatur in flumine felicis baptistæ manibus infundenda. Descendunt angeli, & cœlorum agmina tota reverentia currunt ad creatorem. Baptizantem & baptizatum numina dominantia circumcingunt. Infundit aquam capiti creatoris creatura nobilior, & dei verticem mortalis dextra contrectat & continget. Bernard. *Serm. de S. Jo. Baptista. Tom. 2. Col. 400. K. L. M.*

Sect. 11. Bur

§. 11. But there are mighty exceptions against it. First *Lactantius* speaking of the Baptism of Christ, saith of him, *Tinctus est*, that to some may seem to signifie, as if he were *dipped* of *John* the Prophet in the River of *Jordan*. Then St. *Ambrose* speaking of it, saith, *in aquis se mersit*; that seems to speak a dipping of himself in the waters. Again St. *Hierom* saith, *caput extulit de fluento*, he put up his head from out of the flood; that seems to import that he was, head and ears, all over immersed into it. Nay lastly, as St. *Mark* saith expressly, ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, that is, (as the Interlineary Version renders it) *baptizatus est à Johanne in Jordanem*, he was baptized of *John* into *Jordan*. (*Mark* 1. 9.) So St. *Matthew* saith as expressly, that Jesus, when he was baptized, went up out of the water. (*Matth.* 3. 16.) Now whether one St. *Bernard*'s single, and bare authority, will bear up, and be able to carry it against all these prejudices, is more than I dare be confident of.

Cum primum cœpit adolescere, tinctus est à Johanne propheta in Jordane flumine. Lactant. *Instit. l.* 4. *c.* 19.

Ex quo enim ille in aquis se mersit, ex eo omnium credentium peccata delevit. *D.* Ambr. *Serm.* 22. *Tom.* 3. *p.* 247. *Ipse Dominus noster Jesus Christus statim ut caput extulit de fluento, spiritum sanctum accepit.* *H.* Hieron. *Dialog. Orthodox. adver. Luciferian.*

§. 12. However, mighty as these prejudices are, (so mighty as to have carried the assent of several along with them) they will in the sequel appear to be in a great measure removable: whether wholly or no, will be left to the Reader's judgment. And that St. *Bernard*, a Person of so great Learning and Piety as he is famed for, who wrote after all these, and may in reason be supposed to have read and considered all these, did notwithstanding believe, and deliver

Dum corporis humilitate dominus undas Jordanis subiit, divinitatis suæ potentia cœli nobis januas pandit. Bed. *in Luc. Evang. c.* 3. *fol.* 68. *col.* 3. The learned *Cajetan* upon the place (*Matth.* 3. 5.) saith, Christ ascended out of the water; therefore his

Christ was baptized by *John*, not by *sprinkling*, or by *pouring* water upon him; but by *immersion*, that is by *dipping* or *plunging* in the water. So is he quoted by Mr. *H. Danvers* Treat. of Bapt. part. 2. c. 4. p. 196. Edit. 2. His own words are. *Baptizatus autem Jesus confestim ascendit de aqua.* his judgment otherwise, gives reason to conceive, that he had in his mind some reason, that did with him counterballance all these, and that he knew how to give a satisfactory answer unto all these. And to every one of them indeed something may be said, perhaps sufficient to render them no objections at all.

Non ergo per aspersionem, aut desuper effusionem, *sed per* immersionem, *seu* submissionem *corporis baptizatus est Jesus à* Johanne. Where *per submissionem corporis* he may mean, not what Mr. *Danvers* seems to understand, a plunging in the Water, but a *bowing of his body downward*, and that may be, only to have his head dipped into the water.

Baptizabat enim quia ipse mundabat, non baptizabat, quia non ipse tingebat. D. Aug. *Tract.* 15. *in Evang.* Joh. *Tom.* 9. *Col.* 132. *B.*

§. 13. And first for *Lactantius*. He, as well as St. *Augustine* learnt from *Tertullian* to use *tinguo* or *tingo* for *baptizo*. And so *tinctus est* in him signifies no more than *baptizatus est*, he was baptized. But that infers not necessarily that he was dipped. Nay *tingo*, from whence comes *tinctus*, is used to denote a way of baptizing different from that of dipping *. And as I shall afterwards produce *Tertullians* authority for *aspersion*, so I shall shew, in its proper time, that *Lactantius* himself, in that very place, did not mean what he said, of *dipping*, but of *sprinkling*.

* *See Dr.* Whitaker *Prælect. de Sacram. Bapt. p.* 216.

§. 14. Then for St. *Ambrose*, his expression is but *in aquis se mersit*, that is, he dipped himself in the waters, not *in aquas se mersit*, he dipped himself into the waters. A great deal of difference betwixt *in* and *into*. The first would import that being in the waters he *dipped* himself, which might be said, though he dipped but part of himself in them. The second would import his *dipping of himself* into

into the waters, which would lye fairliest to be understood of a *total immersion*. But *se* himself, seems to import his *whole self*, whether he dipped himself into, or but in the water. It doth but seem so: it doth not necessarily so import. Nothing is more ordinary than such Synecdochical expressions, wherein the whole is put for but a part. Who, that had casually slipt with but one leg or foot into a water, would not presently say, he had wet himself? who would understand *Aspersit me labe*, he asperſed me with a spot, otherwise than by *aspersit mihi labem*, he asperſed or sprinkled a blot or spot on me? who would think the *labes*, spot or blot, so great as to co-extend to the whole person, to spot or blot him all over? Who understands our Saviour's saying to St. *Peter* (*Joh.* 13. 8.) ἐὰν μὴ νίψω σε, If I wash thee not, to intend any thing more, than, if I wash not thy feet? We have shewn before how the expression concerning our Saviour's not washing himself before meat, was ὅτι οὐκ ἐβαπτίσθη, that he was not *dipped*, literally *he*, as here, whereas the meaning was, his *hands*, the manner of the Jews being not wholly to *dip* themselves, but their *hands*, (nor always that neither, but sometimes) before they did eat. So here *se mersit* in St. *Ambrose*, is not all himself, but some of himself, and particularly his *head*, the *dipping of the head* being a (if not *the*) manner of baptizing in St. *Ambroses* time, as we shall after shew from St. *Hierom* and St. *Augustine*, contemporaries with St. *Ambrose*, and therefore in his time. Nay, who can tell whether that expression intend any more, than his going into the water, which he could not do without *dipping* himself into it, unto *John* to be baptized of him? Not to add what yet wholly overthrows this testimony of St. *Ambrose*, and makes null all that can be pleaded from it more than what I last mentioned, that the speech it self, if referring unto *Christs baptism*, is not true: for it makes our Saviour to be his own baptizer, which is directly contrary to the Text, which saith not that he baptized himself, but, that he was *baptized of John*: unless any will allow

of Rebaptization, and say that our Saviour was twice baptized, once by St. *John*, because the Scripture saith so, and another time by himself, because 'tis so said by St. *Ambrose*; but that (*Rebaptization*) I think in these days goes down with no party, whether *Pædo-*, or *Anti-Pædobaptists*: though it is thought that the baptizing of those, who were by *John Baptist* baptized in *Jordan*, was so performed: that being a way of baptizing in use among the Jews.

See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ on* Matth.

§. 15. And by this which hath been said concerning St. *Ambrose*, an Answer is already given to what is objected from St. *Hierome*. For *caput extulit de fluento*, he put, or lift up his head out of, or from under the water, can signifie only, that his head, and not that his whole body was under water: without better proof of it than so: No more than that of the Poets, *Hæc sanctè ut poscas, Tiberino in gurgite mergis Mane caput bis terque---*

Pers. Sat. 2. v. 15, 16.

proves that the person he speaks to, dipped his whole body two or three times in the river, because he did so with his head: unless it were impossible for a man to dip his head, without dipping his whole body too: which I think none will say.

§. 16. But what shall we say to St. *Mark*? That, I confess, looks like somewhat to the purpose, yet will be capable of receiving an Answer, whether satisfactory enough, I dare not undertake. But, such as it is, an Answer I have to return, furnisht therewith from *Beza*, a man whose skill in Critical learning, I need not publish. And 'tis this, that εἰς here is put for ἐν: which *Enallage* he had (as he saith) before made frequent mention of. And then, he was baptized of *John* εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην here, will be no more than, ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ (ver. 9.) *in Jordan*, as our Translation, as well as *Tindals* renders it, agreeably to the rendring both of *Beza*, and the *Vulg.*

The Syriac, Arabick and Persic Version render it so too: the Æthiopic, in fluvio Jordanis, in the river of Jordan.

Vulg. Latine. And that will not necessarily infer a *total immersion.* For a Man might be baptized *in Jordan,* who was not wholly dipped *into Jordan.* Unless the meer force of βαπτίζω will infer it; the contrary whereto hath been, I hope, sufficiently made out.

§. 17. Now towards the making good of the Enallage here of εἰς for ἐν, I shall note first, that this *Preposition* εἰς is never, that I find, in all the *New Testament,* besides this place, used after βαπτίζω, or any derivative from it, before a word signifying any *River, Pool, Fountain,* or *Water* whatsoever, so that it is in this sense but an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, a word used but *once.*

§. 18. Next I shall note, that it is very frequently after βαπτίζω set before other words, where it is incapable of having any such signification, as must necessarily infer an *immersion* into that thing which it is set before. Hence we read, *Matth.* 28. 19. βαπτίζοντες εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς, &c. baptizing them in the *Name* of the *Father,* &c. So *Act.* 19. 5. ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τῦ κυρίε, they were baptized in the *name* of the Lord Jesus. So 1 *Cor.* 13. ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλε ἐβαπτίσθητε; were ye baptized in the *Name* of *Paul?* and (*ver.* 15.) lest any one should say, ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβάπτισα, that I had baptized *in my own name.* Again we read of being baptized, εἰς Χριςὸν, *into Christ, Rom.* 6. 3. and *Gal.* 3. 27. But surely that signifies not being *immers'd* or *dipt* into Christ; no more than by εἰς τ Μωσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο, (1 *Cor.* 10. 2.) is signified the *Israelites* being *dipt into Moses*; or by εἰς τ θάνατον ἀυτῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν, (*Rom.* 6. 3.) is signified our being literally *immersed* or *dipped* into the *death* of *Christ*; or by εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν (1 *Cor.* 12. 13.) is signified our being literally *dipped into one body.* And when (*Act.* 19. 3.) the question is asked, εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε, *unto* (so we read it even there, not *into*) what, were ye baptized? the answer is, not, εἰς ὕδωρ, into *water,* nor εἰς Ἰορδάνην, into *Jordan,* but εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννε βάπτισμα, *unto* (again, not *into*) *John's baptism.* But *John's baptism* was not *water,* but

but a baptism or washing *with Water unto Repentance:* whence it is called βάπτισμα μετανοίας, the *baptism of repentance*, Act. 13. 24. (and elsewhere.) And there (in *ver.* 5.) St. *Paul* said, *John* verily ἐβάπτισε βάπτισμα μετανοίας, *baptized with the baptism of repentance.* So then, no more appearance of εἰς in conjunction with βαπτίζω, where any proper *immersion* or *dipping* is signified.

§. 19. Let us now see how the case stands with ἐν. Now that we meet with frequently joined to βαπτίζω, and yet never signifying an *immersion* or *dipping* into that (be it what it will be, *Water*, *River*, or *Sea*) that follows it: but signifying either (1.) the *Place* in which the *Baptism* was performed: as ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ (Matth. 3. 6.) *in Jordan*; ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, (*Mark* 1. 5.) in the *River* [of] *Jordan*; ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, (1 Cor. 10. 2.) *in the Sea:* or else (2) the *Instrumental* Matter wherewith it was performed: as when *John* said, (*Matth.* 3. 11.) I indeed baptize you ἐν ὕδατι *with water*; as also *Mark* 1. 8. *Luk.* 3. 16. *Joh.* 1. 26. So when he said, (*Joh.* 1. 31.) I am come baptizing ἐν ὕδατι *with water*; and again, *ver.* 33. he that sent me to baptize ἐν ὕδατι *with water.* And to shew that ἐν ὕδατι here signifies *water* to be the *Instrument of Baptism*, we have ὕδατι the *Dative* case (the *case* of the *Instrument*) set without ἐν in several places: and particularly, (*Act.* 1. 5.) where saith our Saviour to his Apostles, *John* truly ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι baptized *with water.* And again (*Act.* 11. 16.) where this saying of our Saviour is remembred, and commemorated by St. *Peter*, saying, *Then remembred I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed,* ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, *baptized with water.* By which 'tis plain, that the meaning of *John*'s *baptizing*, ἐν ὕδατι, is the same, and no more than, his baptizing ὕδατι (barely, and without ἐν) *with water*, and with that as the *instrument* wherewith he performed his action of baptizing; or, more agreeable to the use of speaking, as the *matter* wherewith he baptized.

§. 20. Shall

§. 20. Shall I add to all this, that ἐν is uſed, and ſtill with βαπτίζω, before ſuch things as there can be no *immerſion* or *dipping into*, or was none intended in the places where 'tis uſed? Such is (1.) the *Holy Ghoſt*: as (*Matt.* 3. 11.) He ſhall baptize you ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ with the *Holy Ghoſt*. So *Mark* 1. 8. So *Luke* 3. 16. Again *Joh.* 1. 33. the ſame is he which baptizeth ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ *with* the *Holy Ghoſt*. So *Acts* 1. 5. Ye ſhall be baptized ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, *with the Holy Ghoſt*; and again, *Act.* 11. 16. Ye ſhall be baptized, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, *with the Holy Ghoſt*. Sure none will be ſo abſurd, as to talk or think of *immerſing* or *dipping* men into the *Holy Ghoſt*; or to think any other, but that as *water* is the outward and viſible *inſtrument* of Baptiſm, ſo the *Holy Ghoſt* was the inward, and *Spiritual inſtrument* wherewith the parties concerned in theſe Scriptures were to be baptized. And ſuch (2.) is *Fire*: as (*Matth.* 3. 11.) where baptizing πυρὶ with Fire, is joyned with baptizing with the *Holy Ghoſt*. So *Luke* 3. 16. Now no man ſure ever thought that by a baptizing with *Fire* was meant an *immerſion* or *dipping into fire*. And if ἐν were not intended to be underſtood, as it is not expreſſed, with πυρὶ, then the form of Speech clearly points it out to be conſidered under ſome notion of *Inſtrumentality* in the buſineſs of that Baptizing; and even determines the former member ἐν πνεύματι to be underſtood ſo too.

§. 21. So then, no proper immerſion or dipping pointed at by ἐν, wherever it is ſet in conjunction with βαπτίζω throughout the whole *New Teſtament*. Now whether all the ſo many other Texts, wherein is no immerſion, muſt, without any neceſſity inforcing thereunto, be interpreted by that only one, where there but ſeems one to be; or whether that (that *only one*) ought not to have an *Enallage* allowed in it, and be interpreted with conformity to all the reſt, let the impartial Reader judge. Only to obſerve, that in the fifth verſe going before there is ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, *they were baptized in Jordan*, were enough,

and

and ſo has been thought, to perſwade, that ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς Ἰορδάνην, in the ninth verſe were to be, as it is in our Engliſh Tranſlation, interpreted ſo too. And ſo St. *Bernards* opinion of our Saviour's being baptiz'd, not by *immerſion* of him into the water, but by an *affuſion of water* upon him, may, for ought I ſee to the contrary, ſtand good ſtill. And then we neither need, nor can have any better inſtance of, or argument for *baptiſmal affuſion*, or *aſperſion*, than that.

§. 22. Nor will what is obſerved from (*Matth.* 3. 16.) where mention is made of Chriſts *coming up out of the water*, prove againſt St. *Bernard*, that Chriſt was baptized by *immerſion*. For (1.) the true reading of that place is (according to the Original ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος) he aſcended, or went up, not *out of*, but away *from* the water. And ſo might he do, that never was in it, but only had been by it. And (2.) the learned *Cajetans* collection from the place, (which I ſee quoted *H. D. p. 196. Ed. 2.* from him) that, becauſe it is ſaid, Chriſt aſcended out of the water, therefore Chriſt was baptized by *John*, not by *ſprinkling* or *pouring* water upon him, but by *dipping* or *plunging* him in the water, is weak, and proves nothing; unleſs no man could be ſaid to aſcend out of the water, who had not firſt been *totally immerſed*, that is dipped, or plunged wholly into it; which is contrary to reaſon, ſenſe, and experience.

§. 23. Nor is St. *Bernard* the only perſon among the Ancients, that was of this opinion: but we have intimation of ſeveral others, and many hundreds of years before him, that had the ſame thought: as will be ſeen in the ſequel of this diſcourſe.

§. 24. And there may be ſome reaſon aſſigned, why our Saviour ſhould will to be baptized, not according to the then, or formerly, uſual way of *dipping*, but according to the way now moſt in uſe by *ſprinkling*; even by his example to ſhew a no neceſſity of perſiſting in that former way of more ſeverity, and leſs decency, and to ſet the Chriſtian Church at liberty from that part of the Yoke of Jewiſh bondage,

bondage, and especially in those places and countries, where that Jewish Ceremony might prove to be, either prejudicial to the health of the Weaker, or scandalous to the minds of the more Modest Converts, and either way a Yoke of Bondage.

§. 25. Nor can I see any reason, why he that departed from the then present way of baptizing, in one circumstance, may not as well be thought, and especially on so weighty consideration, to do it in another. The way then was for the Proselytes to be the *dippers or baptizers* * *of themselves*, if *Maimonides* give a true account of the Tradition in that case. But Christ did not baptize himself. But, to settle a distinction betwixt the *baptizer*, and the *baptized*, as well then by his example, as he afterward did by his word, he was baptized of *John*, *per manum Johannis*, by the hand of *John*, if the *Persic Version* of *Mark* 1. 9. mistake not: as I know no reason to think it doth. No more improbability then of his being baptized differently from others, in respect of Manner, than of *Agent*. And so St. *Bernards* Conceit hath two legs, the Opinion of Former Writers, and Reason for that Opinion, besides his own Authority, to stand upon.

* *Omnis baptizatus necesse habuit, ut totum corpus suum intingeret, jam nudatum, mersione una*— Maim. *in* Mikvaoth, *cap.* 1. & 4. — *Et tum immergit ea seipsum. Id. ib.*

§. 26. But it is time I should proceed to the next *Century*. Now that, like the first, was an Age scant of Writers: and of what was written, little concerned, or is left remaining, that did concern Baptism. And therefore here again our intelligence must be expected to be no other but dark, and scanty. And yet such glimmerings at least of light are left us, as will enable us to discern some footsteps of this practice even in it. And even, if it said not the least thing for us, whilst it saith nothing at all against us, which yet hath its mouth wide open against other errors then broached, or disseminated in the Church, its *silence* is to be interpreted as a *consenting* to us. And the same will be

be as rationally to be said for any following, as for this former Age, wherein through want of Writers on this subject our intelligence shall either wholly fail us, or prove penurious and scanty to us.

§. 27. *Justin Martyr* flourished in this Age (about *An. Chr.* 150.) By what the *Centuriators* say from this Author, one would think he had been an asserter of *total dipping*, saying, as they report from him, *atque ita hoc lavacro mersati lustrantur*, *i. e.* and so being *dipped* in this laver they are cleansed. But I suppose those Authors rather consulted some Translation, than the Original, or else mistook in their own Translating. For in all that whole passage, as it was penn'd by the Author, there is not one word, that signifies *immersion*, *mersasation*, or any thing of like import: unless λύω, or some derivative from it, as λύομαι, λυτρὸν, λυσόμενος, signifie any such thing, as they do not; for there is no other word there so much as looking that way. Rather there is something that favours Rantization, or Sprinkling. For having first spoken of that baptismal washing (I say *washing* not *dipping*) whereby men are regenerated in Baptism: and having alledged as grounds for that practice, first our Saviours saying, *except ye be born* again, *ye cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*; and then that saying of the Prophet *Isaiah*, *wash ye*, *make ye clean*, *&c.* he proceeds to declare, that the Dæmons τὸ λυτρὸν τοῦτο ἀκούσαντες having heard of this (as it is by him interpreted) *baptismal washing* preached by the Prophet, in imitation thereof introduced the fashion of Rantization or Sprinkling to be used by their Worshippers, when they approached to their Temples, and addressed their Prayers, and offered their Sacrifices unto them. Which is an intimation of an use of Rantization in Baptism, or at least of a fitness of that usage in baptizing: and

Magdeb. Cent. 2. col. 110. l. 48.

—ἐνήργησαν καὶ ῥαντίζειν ἑαυτοὺς τοὺς εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν ἐπιβαίνοντας καὶ προσιέναι αὐτοῖς μέλλοντας, λοιβὰς καὶ κνίσσας ἀποτελοῦντας— *Just. Martyr. Apol. 2.*

Et est notandum, quod

and that that Author did not think otherwise than well of it; whilest he does not discover and declare any erroneousness in that Heathen practice as differing from, and so wronging, by misrepresentation, what was in use among the Christians: but rather pleads the innocency of it, whilst he shews to the Heathen Emperors, that practice of the Christians to be but such, as the very Gods themselves whom they did Worship, did in some respect and measure approve of, and conform unto; and had taken up from the same Prophetick promulgation, whereon the Christians had founded, or at least whereby they confirmed their baptismal purgation: and therefore such as they ought not to be offended at. In short the Rantization of the *Heathens* founded on that Prophecie, that was applied to *baptism* by the Christians, is some though but an obscure intimation of such a practice used by them in their *baptismal introductions* of Members into their Church. And for the *Damons* imitation of the Christians in their Baptism, *Tertullian* is by Mr. *Gataker* produced as a further witness: as more, no doubt, might be, if there were need for it.

pagani sive gentiles circa fontes templa sua facere solebant, aut saltem ibi semper aquam habebant, per cujus aspersionem purificari credebant: & inde delubra vocabantur quasi purificantia: & ita quodammodo figuraliter ad baptismum tendebant. Guil. Durant. *Rational. Divin. Officior. l. 6. fol.* 147. *col.* 1.

Quomodo autem populi veteris, sic & Christiani sacros ritus amulatus est hostis ille humani generis. Tert. *præscript. c.* 40. [*Ipsas res de quibus Sacramenta Christi administrantur amulantes affectavit exprimere in negotiis Idololatriæ*] *At quasnam illas? ea nimirum quæ in* Baptismo Christiano *& in sacra cœna adhibentur elementa.* [*Tingit enim inquit, & ipse quosdam, utique credentes & fideles suos: celebrat & panis oblationem.*]. Gataker, *Adversar. cap.* 42. *p.* 418. *See above ch.* 8. *S.* 4. *marg.*

§. 28. But a clearer intimation we have of it in a story related to us by the *Centuriators* of *Magdeburg* from *Nicephorus Callistus*, in whom it is;

Magdeb. cent. 2. *c.* 6. *col.* 109, 110. Niceph. *Eccl. Hist. l.* 3. *c.* 37. Whitgift *Answ. to T. C. Tract.* 9. *p.* 519.

and

and which is also referred to by *Archbishop Whitgift* in his Answer to *T.C.* The Story is this; that in the time of *Marc. Aurel. Antoninus* (who began his reign *An. Chr.* 161.) a certain Jew travelling together with some Christians was Converted, and falling very sick, desired *Baptism*: but that they, having neither Priest to do it, nor *Water* to do it withal, at first refused him: yet afterwards, overcome by his urgent importunities, yielded, as far as they could, to his request, and *sprinkling sand* instead of water three times upon him, they baptized him in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Whereupon the man recovered. Now if *sprinkling of water* in Baptism, at least in some cases, had not been an use, and that a known one, at that time, how should it have come into their heads to have used any such action? As in the form of words it is certain they kept close to the Ecclesiastick usage, so it is not to be doubted, but they did so in the manner of acting. And when report was made of what was done to the Bishop of *Alexandria*, or more probably of *Corinth*, and his opinion asked in the case, he after consultation had with the Church about it, thereunto answered, that the man was baptized, *si modo aquâ denuo perfunderetur* (as they say) were he but *sprinkled* again with water, or had he but water *poured* on him again. Where 'tis plain, nothing was disapproved of in that action, or declared insufficient, not the Baptizer, not the form of Words, not the manner of application by *sprinkling*, but only the want of that Element which was proper for Baptism: which if used, though in the same way of application to him, that the *Sand* had been, the Baptism was pronounced to be sufficient. Than which what proof can be desired more clear or more full? A like Story to this, if not the very same with this, *Johannes Moscus*, who lived about the year 600. relates to have happened in his time, as *Vossius* saith *de Baptismo*, pag. 348.

§. 29. We

§. 29. We have yet in this Age another intimation of this usage in *Tertullian*, who flourished in the latter end of this *Century*, and in the beginning of the Century following. His words are, *Quis enim tibi tam infidæ pœnitentiæ viro aspergine unam cujuslibet aquæ commodabit?* Who will pleasure you, who are a Man, to whose penitence so little trust is to be given, with *one sprinkling* of any water? Now that the speech hath reference unto *baptism*, the words immediately foregoing do sufficiently intimate. For, saith he, I do not deny the Divine benefit, that is, the abolition of sins, to be every way safe [that is secure] to those that shall go into the water, that is, be baptized. Now such an allusion unto *baptismal sprinkling* would not have been made by *Tertullian*, a Man so accurately skilful in all the rites of the Church, had it not been a rite, and that a known one too, of the then present Church, to baptize, if not always, or ordinarily, yet in some cases, by *sprinkling*. An evidence this of such importance, at least as to me it seems, as were sufficient to over-sway with, and carry away the assent of any modest Inquirer: as assuredly it did his, in whose favours to their cause the *Anabaptists* do so much glory, I mean B. *Taylor*. Whence that acknowledgment which he makes hereof, in his Cases of Conse. (*l.* 3. *ch.* 4. *Rul.* 15. *S.* 13. *n.* 9. *pag.* 644.) the very place where his greatest liberalities on them, as to this matter, are bestowed. And of this sprinkling, besides what is implied in the former testimonies, there was some little use in the Primitive Church. *Quis enim tam infidæ pœnitentiæ viro aspergine unam cujuslibet aquæ commodabit?* says *Tertullian*, speaking to an impenitent Person: Who will afford thee so much as one *sprinkling* of water? (meaning) for his *baptism*. So he.

Tertull. *l. de Pœnit. c.* 6.

Neque enim renuo divinum beneficium, i. e. *abolitionem delictorum inituris aquam omnimodo salvum esse.* Tertull. *ib.*

De Pœnit. c. 6.

§. 30. But becauſe there may be others, not of altogether ſo ſanguine a belief as I am in theſe concerns, who yet are waxie enough to take other more ſiniſter impreſſions, I will proſecute my Inqueſt into Ages of the Church more remote than this, and farther diſtant from the firſt: as hoping that, if we ſhall find this to have been an uſe, not only begun in the *firſt*, but continued in the *following Ages* of the Church, and, if in any Age, or Ages of it, it ſeem interrupted, for want of a full intelligence of what was done in thoſe Ages, yet again revived, and ſtill continued on in the following, it will neither be refuſed as novel, nor rejected as antiquated, but revived as Catholick, ſo far at leaſt as to be thought lawful, yea and fitting too to be uſed on juſt occaſion for it.

§. 31. If we go on then to the *Third Century*, early in that (about the Year of Chriſt, CCXX.) we find *Potamiæna* a Noble Virgin of *Alexandria*, and a Diſciple to *Origen*, Martyred. *Baſilides* a Souldier led her to Execution. But not long after, himſelf (whether wrought upon by her communication in the way to, or by her courage and conſtancy at, her Execution, or by appearing to him afterward in a Viſion, I know not) becomes a Convert, and profeſſes himſelf a Chriſtian: and upon his avowed profeſſion of it is caſt into Priſon. There he is viſited by the Brethren, that is the Chriſtians, and having ſatisfied them touching his converſion, by them received the Seal of the Lord, that is, was *baptized*, and the next Day ſuffered Martyrdom by *beheading*. Taking it for granted, that by receiving the *Seal* of the *Lord*, is meant *being baptized*, as not only Dr. *Hanmer* in his *Engliſh* Marginal Notes on *Euſebius* gloſſes it, but the *Centuriators* of *Magdeburg* report it, and that moſt agreeably to the Primitive Idiom, calling *baptiſm* σφραγῖδα, a *Seal*, I ſhall refer it unto the indifferent Reader to conſider and determine, all circumſtan-

See *Euſeb. Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. 6. c. 5.*

Greg. Nazianz. *Orat. 4. p. 638, 639.*

ces

ces of the *Place*, *Persons*, and *occasion* duly weighed, with what probability this baptism could be performed by a *Total immersion*, or rather how utterly improbable it must be for any such thing to be then done. And if that could not be, then it must needs be yielded to be done some other way, that had more of *privacy*, and less of *danger* to be discovered in it, namely by an *aspersion* or *Sprinkling* of water on him: where not so much the quantity of water applied, as the application of that water for such purpose as in that Sacrament is designed, is the thing most principally to be considered.

§ 32. And that the *baptizing* of this Person thus on this occasion was not one single swallow, but that it was an *usual thing* so to do, we are assured, as far as the Authority of the *Centuriators* is able to assure us of it. *Ita & in Carcere* baptizabantur *converſi. Magdeb. Cent. 3. cap. 6. col.* 123, & 136.

For they, speaking of the usages of this Age in *Baptism*, tell us, not only that even in Prison Converts were baptized, but that to them at least it seemed *receptum* a received thing, that is, received into use as an ordinary practice: and it may be I may give some further instance of it by and by.

§. 33. But if there could be any doubt of this, there can be no doubt of the baptizing of *Novatus*, (or *Novatianus*, for he is called by both names) about *An. Chr.* CCL. not by a total immersion, nor so much as a *partial mersation*, but by an *affusion*, (ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ ἐν ᾗ ἔκειτο περιχυθείς, as the Historian reports it from *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome* at that time) *being sprinkled, when he was baptized, in the very same bed, whereon he lay dangerously sick, and like to die.* And for a further confirmation hereof, if need were, it might be alledged, that when *Fabian* Bishop of *Rome* (who was crowned with Martyrdom, *An. Chr.* CCLIII.) designed to make the same *Novatus* a Priest, he was with- *See* Euseb. *Eccl Hist. l. 6. c. 43.* Surius *Concil. Tom. 1. pag. 222.*

ſtood by the Clergy in general, and by many of the Laity, upon the account of the unlawfulneſs of making any one a Prieſt, ἢ ἐν κλίνῃ διὰ νόσον περιχυθέντα, who had been ſprinkled, that is baptized by *ſprinkling* on his Bed. Which unlawfulneſs, if not before, (as 'tis ſuppoſed by *Surius* to have been) was afterward fixed by Canon, in the Council of *Necocæſaria* in the *12th.* Canon of that Council, cuſtome Eccleſiaſtick in the mean time prevailing as, and having the power of, a Law. Which notwithſtanding, *Fabian* finding ſome relaxation allowable by Law, even towards perſons ſo baptized, upon weighty reaſons (ſuch as notable *diligence*, and *faithfulneſs* in perſons fit for the Prieſthood, beſides *ſcarcity* of Men) prevailed to have *him* ordained, giving aſſurance, that he would ordain no more ſuch. Now this neither would he have done, nor the other have ſuffered, had not both he and they judged him *ſufficiently baptized.* And, as I ſuppoſe, the *Ordination* of ſuch Perſons to the Prieſthood was not prohibited by the Fathers, becauſe they thought them not ſufficiently baptized, but becauſe they thought it unfit that ever they ſhould be Prieſts who *deferred ſo long* before they would declare themſelves to be Chriſtians (whatever B. *Taylor*, or the *Anabaptiſts* from him, ſuggeſt to the contrary) ſo I preſume the Clergy and Laity of *Rome* to have oppoſed his ordination in particular, upon other accounts than the nullity and inſufficiency of his baptiſm: and particularly, among the reſt, for his neglecting, after his recovery, to have the *Confirmation* of the Biſhop, according to the Cuſtom or Canon of the Church, as *Nicephorus* ſhews, and *Chemnitius* notes, and as Pope *Cornelius* himſelf declares;

Ἐὰν νοσῶν τις φωτισθῇ εἰς πρεσβύτερον ἄγεσθαι ὐ δύναται.
Ordinatus eſt Presbyter ab Epiſcopo, ſed contra Canones, quibus minime licebat, quenquam in lecto propter morbum baptizatum, ſicut huic contigerat, in clerum aſſumi. Surius *Concil. Tom.* 1. *p.* 223.

Duct. Dubitant. l. 3. *c.* 4. *S.* 13. *n.* 9. H.D. *Treat. of Bapt. part* 2. *c.* 3. *pag.* 203. *Edit.* 2.

Niceph. *l.* 6. *c.* 3. *Et* Cornelius *apud* Euſeb. *l.* 6. *c.* 33. *narrat* No-

declares: which *Confirmation* (instituted, as *Polydore Virgil* tells us, by *Clem.* 1.) was so necessary, that no man was supposed a *perfect Christian man*, if that Rite and Ceremony were by negligence omitted. Which notwithstanding, *Cornelius* sufficiently owns his Baptism, whilest he accuses him for forsaking the Church of God, wherein he was baptized; and so does St. *Cyprian* too, whilest he acknowledges him to have been baptized therein. Nor do I discern any exception made against the *manner of his baptizing*, but either against his staying so long before he was baptized, or against his omitting some Rites, then usual in the Church, after his baptism. And yet those that were so baptized, the *Centuriators of Magdeb.* tell us, were only *sprinkled*, not dipped, nor dowsed with water in any great quantity poured upon them.

vatum *in morbo in* lect› baptizatum. *Et addit; si tamen accepisse dicendus est. Neque enim reliqua consecutus est, quorum oportet participem fieri secundum Ecclesiæ Canonem, neque* obsignatus *est ab Episcopo.* Chemnit. *examp. part.* 1. *pag.* 84. Polyd. Virg. *de Rerum Invent. l.* 5. *c.* 3. *Qui autem sic baptizabantur, non mergebantur, nec perfundebantur, sed aquâ. solùm aspergebantur,* Magdeb. *cent.* 3. *cap.* 6. *col.* 126. *Ubi & ipse baptizatus prius fuerat, D.* Cypr. *ad Fubaian.*

§ 34. But what stand I so long, and so hard pressing one instance; when the *baptizing of sick persons in their beds*, which must be done by way of *affusion* or *aspersion*, was no rarity in those days? which persons, from their being baptized ἐν κλίναις, in their *beds*, were called *Clinics*, as *Musculus* telleth us briefly, and *Spondanus* more largely. And for proof thereof the Centuriators truly refer us to S. *Cyprians* Epistle to *Magnus l.* 4. *Ep.* 7. In which Epistle he doth prolixly shew to that *Magnus*, what

Hinc erat quòd olim quamplurimi baptismum ad extremum usque vitæ terminum differebant, quò puri ac puti ex hac vita migrarent, itque ita non nisi in articulo mortis per aspersionem se in lecto baptizari sinebant, quos eam ob causam clinicos *vocabant.* Wolfg. Muscul. *loc. Com. de Baptismo, p.* 741. *Qui in* lecto baptizabantur, *ab aliquibus (ut auctor est* Cyprianus, *ep.* 76.)

tion Chriſtiani, ſed Clinici *appellabantur. Quæ vox etiam apud* Hieronymium, *ep. 26. ad* Euſtochium, *& ep. 30. ad* Ocean. *accipitur pro ægro qui* lecto *decumbit, nec inde ſe movere poteſt: à* κλίνη lectus. *Utiturque ea voce eâdem ſignificatione* Plinius *lib. 15. c. 5. Et Paralyticum, cujus fit mentio,* Joh. 5. *idem* Cyprianus *ep. 76.* clinicum *vocat, eò quòd* 38. *annos in infirmitate fuiſſe dicatur,* Spondan. *Epit. Baron. an. Chr. 254. p. 269. Et in* lecto *quidem ægrotantes* [baptizabantur] *quod prolixè oſtendit,* Cyprianus *in ep. ad Mag. Magdeb. cent. 3. c. 6. col. 126.*

Quæſiſti etiam frater chariſſime, quid mihi de illis videatur qui in infirmitate & languore gratiam dei conſequuntur, an habendi ſint legitimi Chriſtiani, eò quòd aquâ ſalutari non loti ſint ſed perfuſi. D. ep. 7. l. 4. Nos quantum concipit mediocritas noſtra, exiſtimamus in nullo mutilari & debilitari poſſe beneficia divina, nec minus aliquid illic poſſe contingere, ubi plenâ & totâ fide & dantis & accipientis accipitur, quod divinis muneribus hauritur. Id. ib.

was his opinion touching them that were *baptized* in their weakneſs and languiſhment; and anſwers that queſtion propoſed by *Magnus* to him, whether thoſe that were ſo baptized were to be accounted lawful Chriſtians, in regard they had not been ſo baptized as could properly and ſtrictly be called a *lotion*, but rather a *perfuſion*, that is, not being *carried to the water*, and there *waſhed with it*, but having *water brought to them*, and in *ſprinkling drops* poured on them. And to the point he anſwers, that he conceives that the divine benefits can in none be maimed and weakned: that is, as I conceive his meaning to be, there is *never the leſt grace* of God beſtowed in *baptiſm* for the littleneſs of the water wherewith one is baptized, where there is no defect of Faith in the Giver and Receiver. And that in the wholeſome Sacraments, when mans neceſſity compels him to ſeek, and God is pleaſed to beſtow his indulgence, *divine compendiums* do the whole buſineſs for believers. And that none ought to be troubled at it, becauſe *ſick perſons* are ſeen to be *ſprinkled*, or to have water ſhed upon them, when they are *baptized*, being they read in ſeveral places of Scripture mentions of *ſprinkling* of water for *purifications* from uncleanneſs, even natural as well as legal. Whence he conceives it apparent, that in *Baptiſm*

tism even the *sprinkling of water* is as good as *other washing* with it. And declares, that according to his opinion whosoever shall in the Church, by the law and right of Faith, have obtained the *divine* grace, (that is, be *baptized*, even though by *sprinkling*, as by the subject of this discourse it must necessarily be understood) is to be accounted a *lawful Christian*. And in fine appeals to the experience, which was had, how free some were from that foul spirit, which they were troubled withal before; how laudably and commendably they lived in the Church; how by the increasing of their Faith, they every day grew more and more in heavenly grace, who upon urgent necessity had been Baptized in their sickness. Which so clear and full an evidence from so eminent a Father, and Martyr as St. *Cyprian*, and so early in the Church as he was, should methinks be of mighty weight to satisfie even the nicest scrupulosity of any sober doubter in the case.

In Sacramentis salutaribus necessitate cogente, & deo indulgentiam suam largiente totam credentibus conferunt divina compendia. Id. ib. Nec quenquam movere debet, quòd aspergi vel perfundi videntur ægri, cùm gratiam dominicam consequantur, quando Scriptura sancta per Ezekiel*em Prophetam loquatur & dicat, Et aspergam super vos aquam mundam, & mundi bimini ab omnibus immunditiis vestris*, &c. *Unde apparet aspersionem quoque aquæ instar lavacri salutaris obtinere. Idcirco quantum concipere & sentire nobis datur, mea sententia hæc est, ut* Christianus *judicetur legitimus, quisquis fuerit lege & jure fidei divinam gratiam consecutus, Id. ib. Hoc denique & rebus ipsis experimur, ut necessitate urgente in ægritudine baptizati & gratiam consecuti, careant immundo quo antea movebantur, & laudabiles ac probabiles in Ecclesia vivant, plusque per dies singulos in augmentum cœlestis gratiæ per fidei incrementa proficiant, Id ib.*

§ 35. In this same Century (*an. Chr.* 261.) was the Martyrdom of S. *Laurence*. In the *Acts* of that Martyr it is related, how one of the Souldiers called *Romanus*, bringing with him a *Pitcher of water* (and by

Romanus urceum *afferens cum aqua opportunitatem captavit, qua eum offerret* Laurentio, *ut baptizaretur*, &c. *Act. S.* Lauren. *p.* 588.

this instance we are informed how *baptisms* were privately administred in times of persecution, even to persons in prison, as to *Basilides* before mentioned) watched an opportunity to offer it to St. *Laurence*, that so he might be baptized, and at length obtained his desire: which (saith Bp. *Taylor*) in that case must needs have been done by *pouring water* on him. Had that holy Martyr, who had the courage to die for the Truth, thought it to be an erroneous practice to *baptize* by any other way but that of *immersion*, and that the *baptism* administred any other way, had been a meer nullity in it self, and but a mockery of the baptized, (nothing more but the throwing of a little water in his face, as some are pleased in their drollery to call our most *Holy Baptism*) he would not upon any terms have consented to it: he could not by any means have been prevailed upon to do it. His doing it then is at once an instance of the thing, and an argument of his approbation of it: which yet had not been, had that glorious Martyr judged that way of baptizing to have been repugnant, either to the nature of the thing, or to the command of Christ, or yet unto the practice of the Church.

Item scribitur in passione beati Laurentii, *quòd* Romanus *attulit urceum cum aquâ, & tunc non fuit* immersus: *patet ergo. So* Bonaventure *argues from this instance against a* total immersion, *l.* 4. *dist.* 3. *art.* 2. *q.* 2.

Romanus *autem accedens ad* Laurentium *cum* urceolo aquæ *fecit se baptizari ab eo. Quod cum audisset* Decius, *de Romano--cum decollari mandavit.* Anthonini *Histor. par.* 1. *Tit.* 7. *c.* 8. *fol.* 91. *col.* 1.

And Surius *in the life of S.* Laurence *tells, that as he was going to his Martyrdom, one* Romanus *a Souldier brought to him a* Pitcher of water *that he might be* baptized *of him as he went; which in that case must needs have been done by* pouring *water upon him.* Fudit aquam super caput ejus—— *B.* Taylor *Duct. Dubitant. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *S.* 13. *n.* 9. *p.* 644.

§. 36. Of the same St. *Laurence* it is also said that, at his entring into Prison, he found there one *Lucillus*, who had wept himself blind, to whom he promised sight, on condition of his

Anthonini *Historiæ Par.* 1. *Tit.* 7. *c.* 8. *fol.* 191. *col.* 1.

his Faith in Chriſt; and that, upon his converſion, being *baptized* he received his ſight. But how can it poſſibly come into our minds, that he ſhould there be *tolly immerſed*? No fancy in its utmoſt extravagancy can imagine any other, but that *water* being either allowed for the Priſoner to drink, or otherwiſe privately in ſome ſmall quantity ſtoln in, he therewith *ſprinkled* him, or *poured* it upon him. Indeed Bp. *Taylor* from the Hiſtorian ſaith, *he poured it upon his head*. And from theſe examples, *Walafridus Strabo* (as that Biſhop tells us) did conclude (and why may not we as well do ſo too?) that in caſes of neceſſity it is lawful to uſe *ſprinkling*.

B. Taylor *Duct. Dub. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *S.* 13. *n.* 9. *p.* 644. Walafrid. Strabo, *de Reb. Eccleſ. cap.* 26.

§. 37. I ſhould here end this Century, but that *Lactantius*, who flouriſhed (*an. Chr.* 290.) ſtands ſo fair in my way, inviting my attendance to his evidence, that I cannot civilly paſs him by. And indeed the rather am I willing to take notice of him, in regard I have before declared my intention to give a more full account of his ſenſe in the proper place for it, which is this. Now he ſpeaking of the *baptiſm of Chriſt* ſaith, that he was baptized by *John* the Prophet in the river *Jordan*, that by that ſpiritual waſhing he might put away his ſins, not his own, which (to be ſure) he had none of, but of that fleſh, which he did bear; that he might ſave, as the Jews, by undergoing Circumciſion, ſo the Gentiles alſo, by *baptiſm*, that is the perfuſion or *ſprinkling* of the purifying dew. Where his Paraphraſing of Baptiſm by the *ſprinkling of the purifying dew*, intimates Baptiſm to have been performed *purifici roris perfuſione*, by the ſprinkling of purifying dew, that

Tinctus *eſt à* Joanne *Propheta in* Jordane *flumine: ut lavacro ſpiritali peccata non ſua, quæ utique non habebat, ſed carnis quam gerebat, aboleret: ut quemadmodum Judæos ſuſceptâ circumciſione, ſic etiam Gentiles baptiſmo, id eſt, purifici roris perfuſione ſalvaret.* Lactant. *l.* 4. *c.* 15.

that is *ſhedding of water* on the party baptized; it not being to be doubted, but that he founded his expreſſion on the then preſent uſage of the Church, at leaſt in ſome caſes, if not generally: nor can it well be ſaid whence elſe he ſhould borrow it. And theſe Teſtimonies without more, I think enough for this Age.

§. 38. If we ſtep forward from hence into the *Fourth* Age, we ſhall find, about the Thirteenth Year of that, a Council held at *Neocæſarea* (ſomewhat before that famous one at *Nice*) and afterward confirmed in the Sixth Council at *Conſtantinople* in *Trullo*. In that Council Fourteen Canons were made. Amongſt them one *viz.* the *12th.* is concerning thoſe who got to be *baptized in their ſickneſs*. And touching them, the decree is, *that no one baptized in his ſickneſs ſhould be ordained a Prieſt.* Now if we remember but, after what manner the *Centuriators* tell us the perſons called *Clinics* were baptized, namely not by *immerſion*, for they were *baptized in their beds*; nor by any larger effuſion of water upon them as they lay in their beds; for that were as ill as, perhaps worſe than, to take them out of their beds and put them into water, and a ſure way to give them, or haſten their death, or highly endanger it; then we muſt conclude, that the way of baptizing ſuch perſons was by an *aſperſion*, or *conſperſion* of water upon them, or in plainer terms by *ſprinkling*. The decree of the Council then is, that ſuch as had by reaſon of ſickneſs been baptized by *ſprinkling*, ſhould be incapable of *Ordination to the Prieſthood*. The conſequent hereof infallibly is this, that there was ſuch a way of baptizing, and perſons ſo baptized then.

Anno 313.

De his qui in ægritudine baptiſma conſequuntur. Siquis in ægritudine conſtitutus baptizatus fuerit, presbyter ordinari non debet. Concil. Neocæſ. *can.* 12. *Caranz.*

Ordinatus eſt Presbyter (ſc. Novatus) ſed contra Canones, quibus minimè licebat quenquam in lecto propter morbum baptizatum, ſicut huic contigerat, in clerum aſſumi. Surius, *Concil. Tom.* 1. *p.* 223.

§. 39. But

§. 39. But here we must note, that the *Council* doth not condemn the *way* of baptizing, but the *Persons* that drive their *baptism* so long, till they could no other way be baptized. Nor do they forbid any from thence-forward to be so baptized: but only declare the incapability of such, as would no sooner be baptized, to be *ordained to the Priesthood*. They do not evacuate their *baptism* as null, and put them out of the state of *Christians*: but judge them unworthy to be of the Clergy, and forbid them to be ordained Priests. In a word, they do not order them to be *rebaptized*, but decree they shall *not be ordained*. So, no quarrel here lies against the *Baptism*, but against the Baptized: and that, not for being baptized so, but, no sooner.

In clerum assumi. Sur.

§. 40. And if we consult the reason, on which the *Council* grounded this Canon, it will appear to be so. That was, not because their Baptism was unlawful, and a meer nullity (as some say by ours) but because the faith (*i. e.* as I conceive, the *confession of the faith*) of those that would not be baptized, till they believed themselves to be no longer Men of this World, but just departing out of it, was not voluntary, but meerly upon necessity. And high reason certainly was on that Councils side: It being unfit that they upon choice should be made Shepheards, who would not but upon necessity declare themselves Sheep. No hope being that they would ever die for the Faith, who till they were going to die, would never declare themselves to be of the Faith. Little expectation, that they should ever by example at their Death encourage others to be Martyrs, who never in their life, before they were going to die, had the courage to own themselves so much as Professors.

Non enim fides illius voluntaria, sed ex necessitate est.

§. 41. And yet was not the Council so rigid neither in its censure, as utterly to exclude them from the very Priest-

Prieſthood it ſelf, but left a Door open for them, even unto that. There was a *niſi*, an exception in the caſe: and upon ſeveral conſiderations they might be admitted thereunto. One was in caſe they did (after their recovery) by very great diligence in their future actings approve themſelves fitted for it. Another was in caſe their faith did evidence it ſelf ſuch, as was like to *abide* in the day of Tryal. And laſtly, in caſe there was a *ſcarcity* of other Men fit to be taken up into holy Orders. Now certainly they would never in any caſe have admitted them to be *Prieſts*, whom they had not judged to be *Chriſtians*. They would never have permitted them to be *ordained*, whom they did not believe to have been *baptized*. It is plain therefore it was the doubt, which they had of the truth of their faith, not any queſtion they made of the validity of their baptiſm, that was the ground of their making this Canon. Which yet may receive further confirmation from another cuſtom in the Church, which was, to admit none to be of the Clergy, who had been *put to penance*. For this ſhews that the thing required to capacitate Men for the Clergy, was *unexceptionable Chriſtianity*. But the *Clinicks* deferring their baptiſm ſo long, and on ſuch reaſons as they deferred it, rendred their Chriſtianity ſuſpicious and queſtionable. And ſo thence it was, not from the manner of their baptizing, that they were debarred the Prieſthood.

Niſi forte poſtea ipſius ſtudium & fides probabilis fuerit, aut hominum raritas cogat. Caranz. Vid. D. Hammond *de Confirmatione c. 4. §. 1. Paragr. 11. pag. 112.*

Concil. Carthag. 4. c. 68.

§. 42. And ſo, upon all accounts, this Council is a fair evidence of a practice of baptizing by way even of *ſprinkling*, ſo early in the Church as the beginning of the Fourth Century.

§. 43. And as this Council, and conſequently this Canon of it, was afterward confirmed in the ſixth Council of *Conſtantinople*, ſo there is fair reaſon to think ſomething eſtabliſhed

eſtabliſhed by Canon (though my ſmall reading ſerves me not at preſent to tell when, or where) long before. For when Pope *Fabian* ordained *Novatus* a Prieſt (about *An. Chr.* CCL.) it is ſaid by *Surius*, as we noted before, to have been done *contra canones*, againſt, or contrary to, the Canons. Canons then there muſt have been againſt it, and more Canons than one, and all before that time, or elſe his Ordination could not have been againſt the Canons. And Pope *Cornelius*'s objecting againſt *Novatus*, that after his recovery he did not obtain that, which he ſhould have done κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας κανόνα, according to the Canon of the Church, viz. *Confirmation* of the Biſhop, is a bright intimation of ſomething eſtabliſhed in the Church about this matter, and by *Canon* too.

Ordinatus eſt Presbyter, ſed contra canones, &c. Sur. *Concil. Tom.* 1. *p.* 223.

Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l. 6. *c.* 43.

§. 44. And if there were no Canon, yet there was ſomething equivalent to a Canon, ſomething that made it μὴ ἔξον, *unlawful to ordain a Clinic Prieſt*, before the time of *Fabian*'s ordaining of *Novatus*; elſe the Clergy and Laity of *Rome* could not have objected that againſt it. And if that unlawfulneſs were not founded on any Canon, but Cuſtom [and even Dr. *Hammond* (that accurate ſearcher into, and obſerver of Church-Antiquities) ſeems not to have been punctually reſolved in the caſe, while he ſpeaks doubtfully of it, ſaying, *that whether Law, or Cuſtome received in the Church,*] then the Antiquity of it may, for ought I know, reach much higher than this, or the foregoing Century, even unto the Apoſtles days.

Ideoque cum illa ſive lex ſive recepta in Eccleſia conſuetudo, de non promovendis ad ſacros ordines clinicis — D. Ham. de confirm. c. 4. *Sect.* 1. *Parag.* 11. *pag.* 112.

§. 45. However from that reſolution of the Church in the caſe, whether by *Canon*, or *Cuſtome*, I ſhall conclude, that

that whereever hereafter we ſhall meet with a *baptiſm* permitted, or perſons baptized upon the account of *ſickneſs*, or, (what is equivalent thereunto) *natural weakneſs*, before the Cuſtomary times of the Church for more ſolemn baptizations, there we are to conclude the Baptiſm ſo permitted, and received, to have been *ſprinkling*, the caſe of the parties concerned therein rendring them incapable of being baptized (without eminent danger of their healths, and even lives) any other way; and that Sprinkling till good evidence be brought to the contrary, (which muſt be ſome Law of the Church ordaining, or ſome inſtance of the Churches practiſing the *Rebaptizing* of the perſons formerly ſo baptized) to have been in the judgment of the Catholick Church held lawful, and a ſufficient baptizing.

§. 46. Not long after the Council of *Neocaſarea* (about the *Year of Chriſt*, 326.) ſhone in the Church with an illuſtrious glory that great Luminary of it St. *Athanaſius*, from whoſe Rays we ſhall borrow a beam, to light us on further towards the diſcovery of this Practice in this Age. This great Author in his 3*d*. Oration againſt the *Arians*, ſpeaking of their *colluding* with the *Form* of Baptiſm, as meaning other things by the words of it, than they truly imported, by way of parallel tells, that other *Hereſies* beſides them, and they not a few, named the names expreſſed in the Form of baptizing, but had perverſe ſentiments concerning the perſons therein named, and did not retain the ſound Faith, and thereupon *gave water* that was inſignificant through the defect of piety, ὥστε ὁ ῥαντιζόμενον παρ' αὐτῶν ῥυπαίνεσθαι μᾶλλον ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ ἢ λυτροῦσθαι, *i. e.* inſomuch that he that was *ſprinkled* by them, was through their impiety rather *defiled*, than redeemed (I ſhould rather ſay waſhed or cleanſed, if

Edit. Pariſ. à Michaele Sonnio, *&c. An. Dom.* 1627. *Tom.* 1. *p.* 413. *Edit. Commelin. Tom.* 1. *pag.* 219.

Adeo ut qui ab illis adſpergantur, ſordeſcant potius pravâ religione, quàm redimantur, Lat. Verſ.

if in stead of λυτρῦσθαι we might read λουτρῦσθαι; for so the Antithesis seems to require, and so I believe the Author intended.) Here 'tis plain he puts ῥαντιζόμενον *sprinkled*, for βαπτιζόμενον *baptized*, which is so fair an evidence of *Baptisms* being in that Age, if not generally, yet sometimes, and on some occasions, administred by way of Sprinkling, as renders that practice indisputable for that time; it being beyond all controversie, that he is there speaking of Baptism, and of the *Arian*, and other Heretical abuses of the Form of it.

ἐπειδὰν δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος ἀλήθεια πεποίηκεν ἡμᾶς μνημονεῦσαι. *ib.* p. 413.

§. 47. In the same Century (*an. Chr.* 364.) was the Council of *Laodicea*. And whereas that Council had decreed in the 46*th*. Canon of it, that such as were to be baptized should before learn the Creed, and upon the Fifth day of the last week say it to the Bishop or Priest, it makes another (the very next) decree, *de his qui in ægritudine baptizantur*, concerning those that were *baptized* in *their sickness*, namely, that such as in that condition had received Baptism, should be taught the Creed after their recovery, that they might be made sensible of the favour that had been vouchsafed to them. I need hot here again discourse what was the manner of *baptizing sick persons*, having so lately, (whilest I was speaking of the Council of *Neocæsarea*) shewn it to have been by way of *sprinkling*. Nor need I for the same reason, argue from the Councils not condemning the Baptism so administred, nor ordering the re-baptizing of such as had been so baptized, to their approving, at least as to the sufficiency thereof, that manner of Baptism.

Qui in ægritudine constituti baptismum perceperunt, sani facti fidei symbolum doceantur, &c. *Concil.* Laodic. *can.* 47.

§. 48. Much about the time of that Council, or a little after (*An. Chr.* 370.) flourished *Gregory Nazianzen*. And by his most passionate arguing

Ἕως ἔτι τῶν λογισμῶν κύριος εἶ, πρόσδεσμε τῷ δωρήματι ἕως οὔπω νοσεῖς καὶ τὸ

σῶμα καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν, &c. *Gr. Naz. Orat.* 40. *p.* 643, 644.

guing againſt mens *deferring their baptiſm* till their ſickneſs was grown deſperate, and they almoſt, if not wholly, paſt either ſpeech or ſenſe, it is evident, that ſome did defer their baptizing ſo long. And that yet in that condition they were baptized, it is likewiſe evident from his preſſing them to be baptized before they had ſo far loſt the uſe of their tongue, that they were not able well to utter, what was on their part to be ſaid at their baptizing; and whileſt their commencing Chriſtians might be grounded on certain arguments, and not on uncertain opinion; with much more to that purpoſe. Now how perſons in this condition could be baptized by a *total dipping*, or any other way but by a gentle *ſprinkling* (unleſs the Baptizer meant to put them out of doubt, and diſpatch them quickly out of the way) the indifferent Reader may with hope of a favourable judgment in the caſe be appealed unto. In the mean time I cannot but take notice of it, that whereas the unlawfulneſs of ſuch a Baptiſm was the moſt powerful argument that poſſibly could be uſed, to draw men off from ſuch a courſe, and haſten their baptizing, if ever they meant at all to be baptized, ſince that on death bed (by *ſprinkling*, and thoſe in that condition were incapable of any other) was perfectly unlawful, (beſides that it ſignified nothing at all to the baptized) becauſe not adminiſtred according to Chriſts inſtitution, which is ſuppoſed to be by dipping, he doth not in the leaſt preſs that argument; nor do any of the Fathers elſe, that I know of: which is a clear evidence, that though he and they wiſhed men ſooner *baptized*, yet they thought that *baptiſm*, which was adminiſtred ſo late, to be in it ſelf lawful, though through their fault, ſo late adminiſtred, and in that manner.

§. 49. In this Age flouriſhed St. *Hierom*: about *An. Chr.* 385. And though he ſpeak not, (that I know of) concerning *ſprinkling*, yet there is in him an intimation of a baptizing by leſs than a *total dipping*. Many things (ſaith

(saith he) which are observed in the Church by Tradition, have Usurped to themselves the authority of a written Law: as for instance, *to dip the head* thrice in baptism, *&c. Here's* dipping indeed mentioned as *a way* used in baptizing, but 'tis not mentioned as *the way*; nor is that dipping of the *whole person*, but only of a part; namely *the head* of the party baptized. And so hence it appears, that a *total immersion* was not always the only way of baptizing; but that as *sprinkling*, (as we have shewed) was sometimes, so sometimes a *partial mersation* was used in stead of it.

Nam & multa alia quæ per traditionem in Ecclesiis observantur, autoritatem sibi scriptæ legis usurpârunt, velut in lavacro ter mergitare caput, *&c. D.* Hieron. *adv. Luciferian.*

§. 50. Contemporary with S. *Hierom*, was *Siricius* Bishop of *Rome*, elected to that See (*à clero populoq;*) by the Votes both of Clergy and Laity (*An. Chr.* 385.) And his Authority (as the *Centuriators* tell us) is vouched, and under the title of *Regula Ecclesiastica*, an Ecclesiastical Rule by *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, for the *baptizing of Infants*, as oft as necessity should require. The necessity for baptizing of Infants can be no other but danger of death, in regard of sicklines and weakness. Now in what manner it was the use in those times to baptize persons in that condition, we have before declared; so that it is almost needless to say, it was not by that severe way of a *total immersion* of them three times into water, but by the more safe and gentle way of *aspersing*, or *sprinkling* water thrice upon them. Nor was his care only for *weak Infants*, but for all others, in what necessity soever they were: whom he willed should be baptized with all speed,

Spondan. *Epit. Baron. An Chr.* 385.

Nam de Infantibus baptizandis, qui nec dum baptizati nascuntur, quoties necessitas exegerit, Regula Ecclesiastica per beatum Siricium prolata demonstrat dicens, &c. Magdeb. *cent.* 9. *c.* 4. *col.* 140.

— Vel his quibus in qualibet necessitate opus fuerit, sacri undâ baptismatis omni volumus celeritate succurri, ne ad nostram pernicicm tendat animarum, &c. Id. ib.

leſt if any, being in that condition denyed *baptiſm*, ſhould depart out of this world *unbaptized*, and ſo loſe both Kingdom and Life, that loſs of theirs ſhould tend to the deſtruction of our Souls.

§. 51. A little after him (about *An. Chr.* 390.) flouriſhed *Aurelius Prudentius*, a man of Conſular dignity, and a no leſs pious Chriſtian, than ingenious Poet. And in him we have a plain inſtance of *ſuch baptizing*, as that the party baptized was *not dipped*, but only *bedewed* with the *water of baptiſm*, and that muſt be by *ſprinkling* or *ſhedding water* upon him. *Cultor dei memento, &c.* O Worſhipper of God (ſaith he) remember that thou didſt go under the *holy dew* of the Font, and Laver, that is, in plain Engliſh, that thou waſt *ſprinkled in baptiſm*: for what elſe can be meant by the *dew of the Font*; and going under that dew?

Cultor dei memento Te fontis & lavacri Rorem ſubiſſe ſanctum, Prudent. *Hymn. ante ſomn.*

§. 52. And let no man think this was a meer piece of Poetry: and that he was compelled to this way of expreſſing himſelf by neceſſity of his verſe: for he was a perſon of ſuch fluency of expreſſion, as that if there had been need for it, he could have otherwiſe expreſſed himſelf. And beſides in another caſe, when he could as well have uſed the word *Immergit*, he dippeth or baptizeth by dipping, he doth uſe *Perfundit*, he *poureth* water on, or doth baptize by *pouring* on water. It is in the caſe of *John the Baptiſt*: and ſo may be added as a ſuperventional teſtimony, or at leaſt as a further light to St. *Bernard's* opinion before mentioned, concerning our Saviour's being baptized by *John* in *Jordan*, not by way of Immerſion, but of perfuſion, not by putting him under water, but by pouring water upon him.

Perfundit fluvio paſtus Baptiſta locuſtis, &c. Prudent. Enchirid.

§. 53. I

§. 53. I will end this Century, and begin the following with St. *Auguſtin*, who lived in both, being converted to the *Chriſtian* Faith, (*An. Chr.* 385.) and in the (31.) Year of his own Life. And he in his Confeſſions (*l.* 1. *c.* 11.) tells us, that in his Childhood, (and therefore this paſſage of his Life muſt of neceſſity be referred unto this Century) being in a fit of ſickneſs and like to die, he earneſtly deſired to be *baptized*: and that, had he not recovered, through his Mothers haſtening care, he had then been baptized. But ſure he had not been baptized by dipping (*pene moriturus*) when he was juſt at the point of Death. That pious care of his Mother, which made her haſten his *baptiſm* to ſave his Soul, would have provided, that, in the manner of his baptizing, nothing ſhould be done that might deſtroy his Body. There was a way then for baptizing of Perſons in danger of Death: that's the thing I hence obſerve: and I leave it to the Reader to think, if he can, how it ſhould be done by *dipping*; or what other ſo convenient a way there was, or could be for it, as *ſprink'ing*.

§. 54. In the beginning of the *Fifth Century* (to proceed βεστροφηδὸν, and turn at Lands end) flouriſhed St. *Auguſtin*, with whom I ended the laſt Century. And as in the firſt Book of his *Confeſſions*, he tells us of his own being like to have been *baptized*, ſo in the *Fourth* Book, he tells us of a friend of his, that really was *baptized*, in his *ſickneſs*: and that, being in a high Fever, and in a deadly ſweat, given over for life, and utterly ignorant of what was done. That the Baptiſm adminiſtred to this Perſon, be it after what manner it would, or could, was a baptiſm, is clearly intimated by St. *Auguſtin*, whileſt he ſaith expreſly of him, *baptizatus eſt*, he was baptized. But whether this baptiſm was adminiſtred by a *total dipping* of the Perſon under theſe circumſtances, (in his ſickneſs; in a *high Fever*; in a *deadly*

Cùm enim laboraret ille febribus, & jacuit diu ſine ſenſu, in ſudore letali, & cum deſperaretur, baptizatus eſt neſciens. *D.* Aug. *Confeſſ. l.* 4. *c.* 4. *See D.* Aug. *ad Pollent. l.* 1. *c.* 26. *Tom.* 6. *col.* 854.

ſweat; given *over* for life; *paſt ſenſe*;) or whether he was not rather baptized by *ſprinkling* of water upon him, I leave even to the moſt prejudicated Reader in the World to judge.

§. 55. The ſame St. *Auguſtin*, whileſt Biſhop of *Hippo*, tells us (in his 22*th*. Book, *de Civ. Dei*, *c*. 8.) how one *Martialis* was converted on his *Death-bed*, and *baptized*. Therefore not dipped: but, what is moſt probable, becauſe moſt uſual, in caſes of neceſſity, *ſprinkled* at his baptizing.

§. 56. But he that ſhall read the Fourth Chapter of St. *Auguſtin*'s ſixth Book againſt *Julian* the *Pelagian*, and there find *perfundi* uſed for *baptizari*; and *perfuſio* for *baptiſmus*, and *perfuſus* for *baptizatus* (though St. *Auguſtin* find fault with *Julian* for uſing that word out of a deſign to put a contempt upon *Baptiſm*, telling him that this word *Baptizari*, though originally *Greek*, yet was by the cuſtom of the *Latins* appropriated to the *Sacrament* of *Regeneration*) will be out of doubt, that Baptiſm was adminiſtred in thoſe days by way of *perfuſion*, *pouring* or *ſhedding* on of water. For wherein elſe can that appellation be founded? And St. *Auguſtin*, that found fault with his uſing of that word, only becauſe not ſo cuſtomarily applied to the thing, as *baptiſm* was, would not have failed to have found fault with him, if there had been no ſuch thing in uſe as was ſignified by that word.

Non enim fruſtra crederis noluiſſe dicere, quòd renaſcitur, ſed quòd perfunditur.

Hoc enim verbum [ſc. baptizatur] *ex Græco Latina conſuetudo ſic habet, ut non ſoleat alibi niſi in* Sacramento Regenerationis *intelligi. Nihil horum dicere voluiſti, ſed elegiſti verbum, quo fieret contemptibile quod dicebas. Nemo enim legentium præferre poteſt natum renato, vel regenerato, vel* baptizato, *ſed facilè putâſti natum præferri poſſe* perfuſo. *Si autem quantum diſtat cœlum & terra, tanto melius eſt perfundi, ut portetur hominis imago cœleſtis, quàm naſci, ut portetur hominis imago terreni, evanuit jam tua iſta invidioſa partitio. Neque enim mirandum eſt, ſi cœleſtis hominis imaginem, quæ ſacrâ perfuſione ſuſcipitur, ſibi vendicat Deus, &c.* D. Aug. *contr. Julian. Pelag. c.* 4. *Tom.* 7. *col.* 1110.

Sect. 57. And

§. 57. And that Baptiſm was performed in thoſe days, not only by *pouring*, but alſo by *ſprinkling* of water on the baptized, is beyond exception declared by that Father in his Book *de Eccleſiaſticis Dogmatibus*, if that Book were his. But becauſe though inſerted among his Works, it is, and I ſuppoſe more truly, imputed to *Gennadius*, who flouriſhed too in this ſame Century, though ſomewhat after St. *Aug.* I ſhall refer it to its proper place.

§. 58. I will not ſay, but that there might be *baptizings* of Perſons in that Age by a *total immerſion* of them. Yet what *Peter Lombard* quotes from St. *Auguſtin*, ſeems to intimate it to have been a faſhion alſo to baptize, not by a total immerſion of the whole Perſon, but by a *demerſion* of the *head* of the Party baptized. After that we had profeſſed our ſelves to believe, we did *three times demerſe, or dip our heads, in the holy Font.* So he.

In hoc ergo fonte antequam vos toto corpore tingeremus, interrogavimus, Credis Deum Patrem omnipotentem? D. Aug. *ad Neophyt. apud* Gratian. *de Conſecr. diſt.* 4. *fol.* 449. *col.* 3.

De trinâ immerſione Aug *ait, Poſtquam nos credere promiſimus*, tertiò capita *noſtra* in ſacro fonte demerſimus. *P.* Lomb. *l.* 4. *diſt.* 3. *Tit. de Immerſione.* Or as *Gratian* reports it, *Poſtquam vos credere promiſiſtis, capita veſtra* —— (which reading I rather approve of) Gratian. *de Conſecr. diſt.* 4. *fol.* 449. *col.* 4.

§. 59. Contemporary with St. *Auguſtin*, (and even in both the Centuries) was *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola*, flouriſhing about *An. Chr.* 420. And from him I find quoted, by *Rigaltius*, a paſſage, which ſeems to intimate even the *Baptiſm* of *John* the Baptiſt to have been, not by *dipping* of the Party baptized into the water, but by *pouring of water* on him. *Dilnit infuſis, &c.* i.e. He waſhes away the ſins of believers by *waters poured on.* The waters *poured* on here muſt certainly be meant to be *poured on the baptized* perſon: or elſe into the River; for he baptized in the River. To con-

Diluit infuſis credentum crimina lymphis, Abſolvitque metus hominum, pœnaſque remittit. Paulin. *Ep.* Nolan. *ap.* Rigalt. *Not. in* Tertull. *p.* 70.

ceive the later is ridiculous: for what ſhould he pour water into the river for? Therefore it muſt be *on the parties baptized.* And then here is another proof yet more, beſides thoſe of St. *Bernard*, *Lactantius*, and *Prudentius*, to ſtrengthen the opinion, that our Saviour was not baptized by dipping into water, but by having water poured upon him. And whether that were ſo, or not, yet ſtill the expreſſion inevitably infers that Authors knowledge of a way of baptizing, other than by a *total* dipping, and even by a *pouring on of water*, in his own age at leaſt, if not in former, and even in the Primitive too, to which the paſſage makes a fair pretenſion, being quoted out of the Authors Poem of *John the Baptiſt.*

Item placuit, ut quicunque parvulos ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, anathema ſit Synod. Milevit. *ap.* Magdeb. *cent.* 5. *c.* 9. *col.* 835. & Caranz. *fol.* 123.

§. 60. In the ſame age (*An. Chr.* 418.) the *Council* of *Milevis* decreed him anathematized, who ſhould deny *baptiſm to Infants* coming new from the Wombs of their Mothers. Now certainly Infants in that condition, cannot be looked upon as other than perſons under great weakneſs, and neceſſarily expoſed to manifeſt danger of health, and even life it ſelf, ſhould they be put to the undergoing of the Severities of a *threefold total Immerſion*, which was the way of baptizing thoſe that were dipped in thoſe times, even Infants and all, if arrived at that hardineſs for ſtrength as to be able to endure it. There muſt therefore be allowed a more favourable way of *baptizing* of new-born Infants (which I preſume alſo was never done, but when the *Infants* were *weak* and not likely to live) unleſs we will put ſuch an Interpretation on the Councils decree, as ſhall expoſe them to a ſevere cenſure for cruelty, even to tendereſt babes, for that very thing whereby they deſigned the greateſt mercy and kindneſs to them, as if they meant to kill their bodies, whileſt they pretended to ſave their Souls. Now I need not tell you, what has been ſo oft

oft already ſufficiently intimated, that the moſt favorable and ſo the moſt befitting way of baptizing in ſuch caſe is that of *Sprinkling*.

§. 61. The *Centuriators* tell us of a *Font*, out of which *baptizato aqua ſuperfuſa*-- the water poured from above on the perſon baptized, went away by a ſecret paſſage made for it below. And this Font was in this Age. And this pouring water on the perſon baptized at it, imports a baptiſm other than by way of immerſion. For this, and the ſtory appendent to it they refer us to *Socrates*, *l.* 7. *c.* 17. That Author ſpeaks of ſuch a *Font*, as had a conveyance for the water by a lower paſſage: but mentions no pouring of the water from above on the baptized. And (becauſe I am unwilling to force a meaning on them different perhaps from their mind, though lying fair in their words) it may be, they did not by *aqua baptizato ſuperfuſa*, intend water poured from above *on*, but *for* the baptized. Though, by the way, this is much the manner of baptizing in *Ruſſia*, according to a Relation of it, that I meet with in *Purchas*'s *Pilgrimage*. For there, as the Relation is, when the water is Sanctified, the Prieſt taketh the Child, and holdeth it in a ſmall Tub, and one of the Godfathers poureth it all upon the Childs head. Yet (to come to the ſtory in *Socrates* again) there he tells us, what is material to our purpoſe, *viz.* a ſtory of a deceitful *Jew*, that having been baptized before by *Atticus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and made a practice of it in ſeveral places, upon avaricious deſigns for mony, to offer himſelf to *baptiſm*, came to this *Font*, offering himſelf to be baptized there alſo: and that when he hanged his head over the *Font*, the water vaniſhed away, once, and again: whereupon his fraud was

Eſt de Columbethra (quæ aquæ in baptiſterio receptaculum fuit) ex qua aqua baptizato ſuperfuſa per interiorem meatum ſecedebat, apud Socrat. *l.* 7. *c.* 17.

Purchas Pilgrim. *part.* 3. *p.* 229. *about* An. Chr. 1557.

discovered. This happened in the Sixth Consulship of *Theodosius*, (*An. Chr.* 415.) Now that, which I note it for, is this. This hanging his *head* over the Font, in order to his being baptized, intimates (what any man would think, that should see a man in that posture, hanging his *head* over one of our *Fonts*) that his baptism was not to have been by an immersion or dipping of his *whole body* into the water, but only by a Sprinkling of water upon his face, or by a pouring of water upon his *head*, at most by a dipping of his *head* only, and no more of him, into the water.

§. 62. In the middle of this Century flourished Pope *Leo*, advanced to the Papacy, *An. Chr.* 440. He was for having the *Solemn* times of baptism observed. Nevertheless he would not inhibit that liberty, which had formerly been taken, to baptize at any time persons in danger of death, in the difficulties of a Siege, in the straits of persecution, in the fear of Shipwrack. Now this being so, it must needs follow, that he must allow of such ways of baptizing, as the circumstances those persons were in would admit of. Which might not be always by way of Immersion, even for want of water, as in sieges, prisons, ships; and sometimes might not be safe, as in case of dangerous sickness, when to baptize by way of Immersion might be more destructive to the baptized, than his very disease, and a sure way to bring a certain death upon him here, whilest we design to save him from a feared death hereafter. And then not only partial mersation, but even affusion, and conspersion, or Sprinkling, will fall under the allowance of that Pope, and be the Practice, which the Church in that Age took, or had granted to it, the liberty to make use of.

Non interdictâ licentiâ qui in baptismo tribuendo quolibet tempore periclitantibus subvenitur: — ut in periculo mortis, in obsidionis discrimine, in persecutionis angustiis, in timore naufragii; nullo tempore hoc verè salutis singulare remedium cuiquam denegemus. Leo, *ep. Decret.* 4. *c.* 6. *pag* 15, 16.

§. 63. In

§. 63. In the Year 499. was baptized *Clodoveus* King of the *Franks*, first brought to believe the Christian Faith by his Queen *Clotildis* who was a Christian, and after to profess it, and be baptized, partly by occasion of a vow, which he had made to *Jesus Christ*, in a battel with *Alaricus*, by whom he was at the instant of being overthrown, but became the overthrower of the battel immediately turning upon his Vow (the like whereto befel *Amurath* the Emperor of the *Turks* in his battel with *Ladislaus* King of *Hungary*) and he not only Routing his Enemies Army, but also killing his Enemy himself with his own hand; and partly by the sollicitation of St. *Remigius* Archbishop of *Rheims* to perform his Vow, to whom he yielded, and by whom he was baptized: and not he alone, but also *Albofledis* his sister, and a great number of his people amounting to some thousands. But how was he baptized? Not by *Immersion*, but by *superfusion*, as we are told in the *Agenda Ecclesiæ Moguntinensis* published by *Sebastian*, *Arch B. of Ments*, and *Prince Elector*. Where this Example is amongst others alledged in justification of baptizing by pouring on of water. Whereof (saith the *Agenda*) we fetch example from the *Apostles*, St. *Laurence*, *Remigius*, and many others, who baptized by Sprinkling, and pouring on of water. And as the *King* himself was baptized, so no doubt was his *Sister*, and all his *people* (*Regis ad exemplum*) baptized also: it being not well to be imagined, why they, who followed him in his

Spondan. *Epitome of* Baron. *An. Chr.* 494. *n. V. & An. Chr.* 499. *n.* IV. Georg. Cassand. *de Baptismo Infantum*, p. 713. *Iste* Clodovæus *primus Christianus fuit inter Reges* Francorum, *à beato* Remigio *baptizatus*. Gotfrid. Viterb. *Chron. part.* 17. *col.* 433. *See* Werner Rolewinks *Fascic. Temp. fol.* 53. Herm. *Contract. Chron. p.* 419. *Flosc. Historici cap.* 3. *p.* 204. *Expedit ut per infusionem aquæ fiat, & non per immersionem. Cujus rei exemplum trahimus ab* Apostolis, Sancto Laurentio, Remigio, *cæteris*q; *pluribus, qui aspergendo & super infundendo aquam baptizabant. Sic Sanctus* Laurentius *urceo aquæ superinfuso baptizavit* Romanum. *Sic etiam* Remigius *Reggem Franciæ baptizavit.* Agend. Eccl. Mogunt. *Edit.* Mogunt. *An.* 1551. *fol.* 22, 23.

his believing, ſhould not follow him in his baptizing, and be baptized as he was, whoſe baptiſm was the cauſe of their being baptized, eſpecially ſeeing the baptiſm of both, (his, and theirs) were at the ſame time; unleſs ſome good *Record* ſhall appear in contradiction to it, which I have not as yet met withall.

§. 64. And now no wonder if *Gennadius*, who flouriſhed towards the latter end of this Century (*An. Chr.* 490. and many Years before) were dogmatical in his opinion of the ſufficiency either of dipping or ſprinkling: to whoſe 74*th. dogma* we are referred for proof hereof by the Right Reverend, the Author of the *Rationale* of the *Common-Prayer*. And with his Teſtimony I will end this Century. *The Perſon* (ſaith he) *to be baptized makes Confeſſion of his Faith before the Prieſt, and being asked, makes anſwer, and after his confeſſion, he is ſprinkled with water, or dipped into it.* To ſuch indifferency was it grown even in that Age.

Dr. Cave *Life of St.* Steph. *p.* 17.

Dr. Sparrow *Rationale of the Common-Prayer, p.* 298. *Ed.* 1661.

Baptizandus confitetur fidem coram ſacerdote, & interrogatus reſpondet: hoc & martyr coram perſecutore facit, quia & confitetur fidem, & interrogatus reſpondet. Ille poſt confeſſionem vel aſpergitur, vel intingitur: & hic vel aſpergitur ſanguine, vel contingitur igne. Gennad. *de Dogm. Eccleſ. c.* 74. *ap. D.* Aug. *Tom.* 3. *col.* 207.

§. 65. In the fore-end of the Sixth Century, *An. Chr.* 517. and in the Seventh Year of *Theodoric* King of *Spain*, was held at *Gerunda* in *Catalonia* a Provincial Council of Seven Biſhops. And in the 4*th.* Canon of that Council it was Decreed, *That Infants, in caſe of weakneſs, ſhould be baptized the ſame day that they were born.* That they ſhould be baptized, this they Decree. But how, they ſay not. Whence 'tis plain, their meaning was, that they might be baptized in ſuch manner, as was moſt ſuitable

Ut parvuli, ſi infirmari contingat, eodem die. quo nati ſunt, baptizentur, Concil. Gerund. *Can.* 4.

able to their condition, and had been uſual in the like caſes in the Church, (for elſe they would have given their determination otherwiſe) and then their baptiſm muſt not have been by dipping, but ſprinkling, or ſomething more favourable and ſafe than a total immerſion. And eſpecially is it rational ſo to conclude, when the way of baptizing (and for ought I know in publick as well as private) was grown to ſuch an indifferency in the Century foregoing, as we ſee by the new cited Teſtimony from *Gennadius*.

§. 66. And agreeably to what that Council decreed in the fore-end of it, it was declared by Pope *Greg.* I. in the latter end of it (for he was choſen Pope *An. Chr.* 590. and died *An. Chr.* 604.) that *it ſhould be free to baptize Infants, in caſe of danger of death, the ſame hour that they were born.* A great Charity was no doubt in this Conceſſion deſigned to the Souls of the poor Babes, namely to ſecure them, as far as Man could do it, from the future infelicities of thoſe that died in an unbaptized eſtate. But we muſt not think, that charity to their *Souls* could conſiſt with cruelty to their *bodies*, and intend the deſtruction of the one, whilſt it pretended the ſalvation of the other. Therefore we muſt think alſo, that the rigors either of a three-fold, or but a ſingle total immerſion, eſpecially in this cold climate of ours, in reference to which that declaration was made by that Biſhop, were not impoſed upon thoſe Infants (*in periculo mortis*) but that a more benign and gentle way, and which better ſuited with the weakneſs of their Infant-ſtate, eſpecially in ſuch danger, was permitted to them. And then we can think of no ſo fit a way for their baptizing, as that of ſprinkling.

Item liberum eſſe Infantes mox in ipſa horâ, ſi eſt periculum mortis, baptizare, Gregorius teſtatur, l. 12. *Ep.* 10. *ap.* Magdeburg. *Cent.* 6. *c.* 6. *col.* 367. *l.* 21.

Baptizare autem vel enixam mulierem, vel hoc quod genuerit, ſi mortis periculo urgetur, vel ipſâ horâ eâdem quâ gignit, vel hoc quod gignitur eâdem quâ natum eſt, nullo modo prohibetur, &c. Greg. *Reſponſ. ad Interrogat.* Auguſtini *ap.* Bedæ *Eccleſ. Hiſt. Gent. Angl. l.* 1. *c.* 27. *fol.* 36. *a.*

§. 67. Nay

§. 67. Nay more, the *Centuriators* from the ſame Authority tell us, that it was *lawful to baptize Women big with Child, or even newly brought to bed*, (*yea even in the very ſame hour, that they were delivered,*) as *Bede* relates it from him. But ſure to dip the former was very *dangerous*, and the latter, *certain death*. And therefore it is without queſtion, that the baptiſm allowed them was one more ſafe, *viz.* that of ſprinkling.

Mulieres gravidas, vel recens enixas licitum eſſe baptizare — Greg. reſtatur, *l.* 12. *Ep.* 10. Magdeb. *Cent.* 6. *col.* 367. *Vid.* Bed. *Eccl. Hiſt. Gent. Angl. l.* 1. *c.* 27.

§. 68. In the *Seventh Century* the *Magdeburgenſians* tell us, that Baptiſm was adminiſtred publickly in Temples: yet not ſo, but that *ſometimes, when neceſſity required, it was adminiſtred in private houſes alſo*. Now that neceſſity, which would keep them from coming to the Temple to be baptized, muſt in reaſon be ſuppoſed alſo to be ſo great, as to keep them from being totally dipped: there being greater danger to them from that *manner* of baptizing, than from the *place* where they ſhould be baptized. And then both *Reaſon*, and the *Uſage* of the Church in the former Ages of it upon ſuch like occaſions, will determine the moſt befitting way of baptizing to be that of *ſprinkling*: not only in regard of the want of conveniencies of Veſſels fit for a total immerſion that might be in ſome private houſes; but alſo in regard that ſick Infants were then to be baptized, whom to dip in that condition, and as the manner of baptizing them that were dipped then was, (*viz.* three times over head and ears) were enough to kill. And he that will conſult *Baronius* may perhaps find an inſtance of one, (and him the Son of an Emperour) by name *Galates* the Son of *Valens*, killed in Baptiſm. The inconſiſtency

Baptizabant in templis: — *In privatis tamen domibus etiam interdum, cùm neceſſitas poſtulabat, baptizatum eſt.* Magd. *Cent.* 7. *col.* 144, 145, 146.

Ann. Chr. 370. 51.

sistency whereof with the Charity of the Church is so visible, or rather palpable, as to need no further demonstration.

§. 69. They tell us also how in the Eighth *Council* of *Toledo*, which was held *An. Chr.* 633. and in the Sixth *Council* of *Constantinople* held in the *Trullus* (the name of a Room within the Emperor's Palace where the Council sate) *An. Chr.* 680. it was decreed *that Baptism should by no means be denyed to any sick Infant*; adding as an Enforcement to their Decree, that *if any should neglect the Soul of any such dying one, he should give an account thereof to God.* And it is certain, that in the Second Canon of this Council of *Constantinople* was confirmed the Council of *Neocæsarea*, and consequently that Canon of that Council, which concerned such as were baptized in their sickness, whereof we made mention before. Well now, sick Infants were to be baptized: and their Baptism by no means to be neglected. The way of baptizing then, was a three-fold immersion. But what if the Baptizer saw he could not so baptize the Infant without endangering the death of it? Must he not baptize the Infant at all? Then he violated the Decree of the Council, and incurred the hazard of answering for the Soul of the Infant, if it perished for want of Baptism. Must he baptize it by the three-fold immersion? Then he endangered the death of the Infant (which though very sick, yet possibly might not die, unless drowned or starved by that baptizing, but recover, as many no doubt in the like case have done) and so incurred the guilt of homicide, which he could not but be loth to have his Conscience charged withall. What must he do then? What? Even take the middle course; neither neglect to baptize it, nor dip it in the baptizing: but do as *Reason* would dictate in the case, and as the *Custom* of the Church on such occasions would direct

Parvulo ægrotanti nullo modo baptismus denegetur; si quis negaverit ejus morientis animam, ille pro eâ reddet Deo rationem. Concil. Tolet. & Constantinop. *ap.* Magdeb. *Cent.* 7. *c.* 6. *col.* 146.

direct him, and baptize it in a gentler, kinder, safer way, by Sprinkling.

§. 70. And the same Observation may be made upon, and drawn from the Law of *Ina* King of the *West Saxons*, (about *An. Chr.* 692.) *That Infants shall be baptized within Thirty days after their birth, under penalty of Thirty shillings* (a great sum in those days.) And that *if any of them died unbaptized, he through whose default that came to pass, should forfeit all his goods.*

Infans intra triginta dies postquam in lucem prodierit, baptizator. Id si non fiat, ter denis solidis culpa pensator. Sin prius vitam cum morte commutârit, quàm sacro baptismate tingatur, rebus suis omnibus mulctator. Leg. Inæ. *c.* 2. *ap.* Spelman, *Concil. Anglic. Tom.* 1. *p.* 183.

An. Chr. 731. *Obiit An.* 735.

§. 71. In the Eighth Century flourished the Venerable *Bede*: in the one and thirtieth year of which he wrote his *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*. And though he do not therein, that I yet find, tell us of any that were expressly baptized by way of Sprinkling (yea so far is he from that, that he is produced as an Author against it, because he in that work tells us of many that were baptized in Rivers, *viz. Glen* and *Swale*) yet still methinks he looks favourably on that way.

Igitur accepit rex Edwinus *cum cunctis gentis suæ nobilibus, ac plebe perplurimâ, fidem, & lavacrum sanctæ regenerationis, anno regni sui* 11°. *qui est An. Dom. incarn.* 627. — *Baptizatus est autem Eboraci die Sancto Paschæ, prid. id. April. in Eccles. Sancti Petri Ap. quam ibidem ipse de ligno, cùm*

§. 72. First because he there (*l.* 2. *c.* 14.) tells us of a baptism of a *King*, by name *Edwin*, who with many of his Nobles and People, was baptized in a *Church*; and then sure not in a River, but in a *Font*: and then most probably by Sprinkling, or pouring of water upon him; there being no remains that I know, or hear of, in *England*, wherein this was done, if any Fonts, of that capacity, to receive into them the whole

whole body of a man, so as to dip it therein; especially if the Rite of being baptized *standing upright* in the waters, as the ancient manner of baptizing is by some said to have been, were to be observed (and it is strange that, if the Fonts in our Churches ever were of that capacity, there should in no part of the land be any one of them remaining, especially seeing there has been since that time no such universal inundation of Heathens, as destroyed all those Sacred Utensils of Christianity, but the Churches themselves, wherein they may be supposed to have been, as that of *York* and *Lincoln* are standing still) and that particular Church being but a *Wooden* one, erected in haste for that present purpose, and so probably unfurnished of such a capacious Baptistery, as was requisite for the total immersion of a person of that Stature.

catechizaretur, atque ad percipiendum baptisma imbueretur, citato opere construxit. Bed. *Hist. Eccles. Gent. Angl. l. 2. c. 14.*

§. 73. Secondly, because in that whole passage, and the rest that follows in that Chapter, where he speaks of baptizing confluences of people, and in Rivers, he never mentions one word of their being dipped, either in Font or River (unless *Baptizo* do necessarily infer it, as I have shewn it doth not) neither *immergo* nor *mergo*, neither *immersio* nor *mersio* being used to express that action; but words of a more general import, which coextend to any manner of Baptismal washing, such as *lavacrum* and *abluere*: and Baptizing in a River doth not necessarily infer a dipping into it. And yet as shie as he is of using *immergo* in the case of Baptism, he is not shie to use it in other concerns. Whence in his Relation of

Quibus diebus cunctis à mane usque ad vesperam nihil aliud ageret quàm confluentem ad se cunctis viculis ac locis plebem Christi verbo salutis instruere, atque instructam in fluvio Gleni, qui proximus erat, lavacro remissionis abluere. Id. ib.

of the Severities of *Drithelm* the Anchoret to himſelf, he hath it twice, and within the compaſs of a few lines.

Solebat hunc creber ob magnum caſtigandi corporis affectum ingredi, ac ſæpius in eo ſupermeantibus undis immergi. — refluentibus circa eum ſemifractarum cruſtis glacierum, quas & ipſe aliquando contriverat, quò haberet locum ſtandi ſive immergendi ſe in fluvio, Bed. *Eccl. Hiſt. l. 5. c. 13. fol. 223. a. b.*

§. 74. Thirdly, becauſe the Reaſon, which he gives, why men were then baptized in Rivers, is not fetcht from any thing in the nature of baptiſm requiring baptization in ſuch places; as becauſe men ſhould be totally dipped, when baptized, and the beſt conveniency for ſuch baptizing was there: but becauſe in the Infancy of that Church, which was then but in its Nativity, *Oratories, or Baptiſteries could not be builded.* Which ſuppoſes, that it was not *choice*, but want of other conveniency, which then led to that River-baptizing: and that, had there been Fonts in Churches, in thoſe Churches, and at thoſe Fonts, ſhould the *people* too have been baptized, as well as the *King*, we ſpake of before, had been.

Sed in Provinciâ Deirorum, ubi ſæpius manere cum rege ſolebat, baptizabat in fluvio Sualva, *qui vicum juxta Cataractam præterfluit. Nondum enim Oratoria vel baptiſteria in ipſo exordio naſcentis ibi Eccleſiæ poterant ædificari. Id. ib. l. 2. c. 14.*

§. 75. Fourthly, in ſeveral parts of his works he expreſſes baptizing by ſuch words and phraſes, as not only, do not by the meer power of their own ſignificancy import *dipping*, but are ſometimes uſed to denote a diſtinct manner of baptizing, differing from that: as is ſufficiently ſhewn in theſe Papers, ſuch as *tingo*, and *undâ perfundo*, &c.

Non baptizabat, quia ipſe non tingebat. Bed. *in Eph. 5. fol. 234. D. Quaſi verò alterius dono, quàm illius quiſquam etiam Sacramento corporalis, & viſibilis baptiſmatis* imbuatur, *Id. ib. Ipſe inſtructos eos verbo veritatis ac fonte ſalutari* ablutos *de ingreſſu regni æterni certos red-*

didit.

didit; Id. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 4. c. 16. Etſi fonte baptiſmatis non eſt ablutus. Id. ib. l. 1. c. 7. Cum rex ipſe Catechizatus fonte baptiſmi cum ſuâ gente abluereturIdib. l. 3. c. 7. fol. 98. b Itaque Epiſcopus — primos provinciæ duces ac milites Sacroſancto fonte abluebat, ib. l. 4. c. 13. fol. 165. a Omnes fide Chriſti inſtitutos undâ baptiſmatis abluit, ib. fol. 166. b. — Plebem Chriſti — lavacro remiſſionis abluere, ib. l. 2. c. 14. fol. 80. b. Nec multo poſt plene curatus vitali etiam undâ perfuſus ſum. Id. ib. l. 5. c. 6. fol. 209. b.

§. 76. Laſtly, I meet in *Bede* with a Relation of a Baptiſm, in the beginning of this, or the latter end of the foregoing Century, that was performed by *perfuſion*, which we have ſeen from St. *Cyprian* to denote a diſtinct way of baptizing differing from a total immerſion. The perſon baptized was *Heribaldus* Clerk to *John* Biſhop of *York*. And the Relation, as made by *Heribaldus* himſelf, in ſhort is, that being by that *John*, in the time of his weakneſs by a fall from an horſe, Catechized and Exorcized, ſhortly after his recovery he was baptized, and that by way of *perfuſion*.

Bede *Eccl. Hiſt. l. 5. c. 6. fol. 209. a. b.*

§. 77. And now who can think, but that this Author did judge it, not only lawful, but even neceſſary, that Baptiſm, (in ſome caſes, as that of women new brought to bed, and children new born, if in danger of death; touching which himſelf hath declared the judgment of St. *Gregory*, with the reaſon alſo of his judgment) ſhould be adminiſtred in a way of more mercy and leſs danger, than that of a total immerſion; even by Sprinkling or pouring on of water?

— quia ſancti myſterii gratia ſicut viventibus atque diſcernentibus cum magnâ diſcretione providenda eſt: ita his quibus mors imminet, ſine ullâ dilatione offerenda, ne dum adhuc tempus ad præbendum redemptionis myſterium quæritur, interveniente paululum morâ inveniri non valeat qui redimatur. Bed. *Eccl. Hiſt. Gent. Angl. l. 1. c. 27. fol. 36.*

§. 78. And with the ſame caution of not baptizing by a total immerſion, but by affuſion or aſperſion, is that Conſtitu-

ſtitution of *Egbert* Arch-biſhop of *York* (ordered about the Year of Chriſt, 750.) unqueſtionably to be underſtood: whereby all Prieſts are injoyned, in caſe of infirmity, with greateſt diligence to adminiſter baptiſm at any hours whatſoever, to all that need it. For it is unreaſonable to think, that the cruelty of a total immerſion was ever deſigned in ſo merciful a Conſtitution.

Ut omnes Sacerdotes, quibuſcunque horis, omnibus indigentibus baptiſmum infirmitatis cauſa diligentiſſime tribuant. Excerpt. 10. Dom. Egberti *Archiep.* Eborac. *ap.* Spelman. *Concil. Anglic. Tom. 1. p. 259.*

§. 79. In the *Ninth Century*, (*An. Chr.* 826.) as *Baronius* in his Annals informs us, came *Herialdus*, King of the *Northmans*, or *Danes*, with his Wife, and a great company of his People to *Mentz*, and in St. *Albans* Church, together with the reſt of his Followers, *ſacri baptiſmatis undâ eſt perfuſus*, had the water of holy Baptiſm poured upon him. In which one expreſſion the *Hiſtorian* notifies unto us two things; firſt the Baptiſm of that King and his People: and then the manner of their baptizing; which was not by *immerſion*, but by *perfuſion*, or pouring of water upon them, whether in greater or leſſer quantity.

§. 80. In the ſame Century flouriſhed *Hincmarus* Arch-Biſhop of *Rheims* (*An. Chr.* 845. or according to *Bellarmin*, 860.) He had a Nephew of the ſame name Biſhop of *Laudum*. That Biſhop upon private injuries, excommunicated all the Prieſts of his Church, interdicting them the *baptizing of Infants*, abſolving of Penitents, and even burying of the Dead. This incenſes his Uncle the Arch-Biſhop of *Rheims*, who thereupon pleads the cauſe of the *Infants* againſt him: urges the authority of Pope *Siricius* upon him, declaring for the *ſpeedy baptizing*, *not* of *Infants only*, but *of all perſons* in *neceſſity*, as we have noted before. Now this preſſing of the decree of *Siricius* by the Uncle on the Nephew, ſhows his approbation of, and conſenting to what that *Pope* had declared for: and that amounted to a baptizing them in a way agreeable to their neceſſity, which could not be a *total immerſion*, but a pouring, or *ſprinkling* of water upon them.

§. 81. Yet

§. 81. Yet again in this Century (*An. Chr.* 850.) flouriſhed *Walafridus Strabo.* (the *Anabaptiſts* grand Patron.) And yet even he, as luck ſerves, is a moſt full, and expreſs witneſs on our ſide. He ſpeaking of the baptiſm of *Lucillus* recorded in the Acts of St. *Laurence*, which is expreſly delivered to have been by *pouring* the *water* on his Head, (if, *fudit ſuper caput ejus*, can ſignifie ſo much) ſaith upon that occaſion, It is to be noted, that many have been baptized, not only by *dipping* them, but alſo by *pouring water* from above upon them; and that they may ſtill be ſo baptized——. This alſo uſes to come to paſs, when the greatneſs of the over-grown bodies ſuffers not a Man to be dipped in the leſſer Veſſels: which is the preſent condition of moſt, if not all the *Fonts* in *England*, ſo that there can be no way of baptizing perſons of *ripe years* in them, but by *affuſion*, or a *partial merſation*. I wiſh thoſe that give ſuch credit to this Author in other things, would be impartial, and give the like credit to him in this, wherein he is ſo full and clear, as nothing can be more, both as to what hath been, and what may be.

Notandum, non ſolum mergendo, *ſed etiam* deſuper fundendo *multos baptizatos fuiſſe, & adhuc poſſe baptizari, &c. Hoc etiam ſolet evenire cùm provectiorum granditas corporum in minoribus vaſis hominem tingi non patitur.* Walafrid. Strabo *de Rebus Eccleſ. c.* 26. *p.* 415.

§. 82. Yet further in this Century (*An. Chr.* 858.) flouriſhed *Nicetas Serronius*, who wrote Commentaries on ſeveral Orations of St. *Greg. Nazianzen.* And in his Commentary on the Fortieth Oration of that Father (which is of *Baptiſm*) If, ſaith he, a deſire and purpoſe to be baptized ſerves you for baptiſm, and you therefore ſeek the glory of thoſe, *qui purificâ aquâ perfuſi ſunt*, who have had the *purifying water ſhed* or *pour-*

Præterea ſi tibi ad Baptiſmum Baptiſmi *cupiditas propoſitumque ſufficit, atque idcirco eorum qui purificâ aquâ perfuſi ſunt, gloriam quæris; ad gloriam quoque tibi ſufficiat ſola gloriæ cupiditas.* Nicet. *Not.* 21. *in* Gr. Nazianz. *Orat.* 40. *Col.* 1062. *Edit. Pariſ.* 1611.

red upon them, *i. e.* have been *baptized*, let then the only desire of the glory serve you too for the glory. This, if the Author be rightly translated (who, I suppose wrote in *Greek*) is a clear intimation of that Author's having in his mind a notice of a *baptizing* by way of *perfusion*, shedding or pouring on of water, which made him paraphrase baptism so; nay more, that he supposed others had the same notice of it too, and would understand what he writ, or else he would not so have written it. Commentaries being designed, not to obfuscate the Authors commented on, by words less usual and of greater obscurity, but to illustrate them, by words more known, and of greater perspicuity, than their own.

§. 83. In the Tenth Century amongst other Ecclesiastical Constitutions of King *Edgar*, (about *An. Chr.* 967.) there is one Canon, deposing from (at least one degree of) *Orders*, the Priest, that, through his default, should suffer any *weak Infant to die unbaptized*: and imposing the *penance* of a three Years Fast on the Infants friends, if the fault were theirs. Now surely he must either never have had, or else have lost his understanding, who imagines that the Infant, in the case supposed by the Canon, was necessarily to be *dipped*. For that were to oblige both the Priest and Parents, under so great penalties as neither would be willing to undergo, to expose the Child to a manifest peril of death, rather than let it go unbaptized. But the Church then could not but know, what had been the practice of the Church in former Ages in the like case: which was to baptize by *aspersion*, or a gentler affusion: and therefore it is to be understood to mean, that the Children so strictly ordered to be baptized, should

Si infans infirmus [absque baptismo] *obierit Ethnicus, & hoc ex culpâ Sacerdotis evenerit, amittat ille ordinationis gradum, & sollicite componat. Et si amicorum negligentiâ acciderit, jejunent illi 3. annos; unum sc. pane & aquâ, & per reliquos 3. dies in hebdomada, & id semper lugeant. Can. dati sub* Edgaro *Rege, apud* Spelman. *Concil. Anglic. Tom.* 1. *pag.* 467. *Can.* 44.

ſhould be baptized after ſuch a way, as was moſt agreeable unto the condition they then were in; and that muſt be by ſprinkling; and not that they muſt be dipped, come on't what could come (life or death) by their dipping.

§. 84. And much about the ſame time, or a little after, were compoſed the Laws of the *Northumbrian Prieſts*, probably by *Oſwald* Arch-Biſhop of *York*. Amongſt which there is one, that under a certain penalty orders *all Children to be baptized within nine Nights*. But what if a Child were ſo ſick, as not to be able to endure *dipping*? Muſt it, rather than not be dipped, be let dye without being baptized? That was not the Law-makers meaning, which was to prevent the Child's dying without baptiſm. Muſt he be dipped then, though that dipping ſhould coſt him his life? That is too irrational to conceive to have ever been meant by any wiſe Law-giver; the end of whoſe Laws is the preſervation, and not the deſtruction of lives. What then? 'Tis plain, nothing elſe could be meant, but that, as the Child was not to be ſuffered to dye unbaptized, ſo it was to be baptized in ſuch a way as would not endanger its death; and that is by ſprinkling, or pouring water in a befitting quantity upon it, according to the practice of former Ages on the like occaſions.

Infans omnis intra 9. noctes matarè baptizetur, ſub pœna ſex orarum. Et ſi infans aliquis intra 9. noctes per negligentiam mortuus fuerit, componatur apud Deum abſque multâ ſeculari. Scd ſi exactis 9. noctibus per negligentiam mortuus fuerit: componatur utique apud Deum, & ſolvantur præterea illi parochiæ 12. oræ, quòd infans tam diu fuiſſet Ethnicus. Leges Presbyter. Northumbr. ap. Spelm. *Concil. Angl. Tom.* 1. *pag.* 469. *Can.* 10.

§. 85. In the Eleventh Century the *Magdeburgenſian* Hiſtorians tell us, that *Infants*, if weak, were baptized even preſently after their *birth*. And (as I have noted in another place) they inſtance, from *Schafnaburgenſis*, in the Son of an Empereſs, baptized, by reaſon of

Cent. 11. *c.* 6. *col.* 260.

his weakneſs, and fear of his death, within three days after his birth. They tell us alſo of a Son of the Queen of *Moguntia*, who was baptized preſently after his birth, and dyed preſently after his Baptiſm. But now, who is able to imagine, that any ordinary Parent, much leſs Perſons of ſuch high Nobility, would ever endure that their *tender Infants*, in that extremity of weakneſs and ſickneſs, ſhould be put to endure the hardſhip of a *three-fold* (or even but one ſingle) *total immerſion* into cold water? How could they expect any other, but that the Font, which ſhould be the Mother of their Spiritual birth, would become the cauſer of their natural death? and that they ſhould be realy, as well as Sacramentally, *buried in Baptiſm?* But Reaſon inviting, and long Cuſtom of otherwiſe baptizing Perſons in ſuch condition authorizing thereunto, no doubt is to be made, but that they were baptized in a way that was compliant with their condition, namely by a gentler application of water ſhed, or ſprinkled on them.

Si puer non baptizatus, libere adducatur ad Preſbyterum [caveat ille] ut eundem protinus baptizet, ne forte moriatur Ethnicus. Can. Ælfrici. 26. ap. Spelman. *Concil. Angl. Tom.* 1. *pag.* 579.

§. 86. And with the ſame gloſs is to be read that Canon of *Ælfric* (about *An. Chr.* 1052.) whereby the Prieſt is ordered forthwith to baptize the Infant that is brought unto him, leſt haply he dye an Heathen.

§. 87. In the *Twelfth Century* (*An. Chr.* 1120.) flouriſhed St. *Bernard*. And we cannot but think that he approved of the baptizing of Chriſtians by way of *perfuſion*, or pouring of water on their heads, whoſe Opinion was, as we have ſhewed before, that *Chriſt* himſelf was ſo baptized of *John* in *Jordan*. But if he had ſaid nothing of that, yet that queſtion of his, in his Epiſtle to *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, when he asks, what nature or reaſon taught, that no mortal Man could ever be a partaker of the

Quænam enim natura ſeu ratio docet internam æternamque ſalutem

the internal and eternal Salvation, whoſe body was not outwardly baptized by a *perfuſion* of it with the viſible element? this queſtion, I ſay, ſufficiently ſhews his opinion of a *baptiſm* by ſuch a way of adminiſtration, namely that it, like Baptiſm any other way adminiſtred, conduced to the internal and eternal Salvation of the Soul, though both to reaſon and nature it ſeemed ſtrange, and was a thing that neither of them ever taught, that there was no being ſaved without it.

mortalium neminem poſſe percipere, cujus foris corpus perfuſum viſibili non fuerit elemento? D. Bernard, *Ep.* 77. *ad* Hug. *de S.* Victore, *col.* 1455.

§. 88. Contemporary with S. *Bernard* was S. *Otho* Biſhop of *Bamberg*, called the *Apoſtle* of the *Pomeranians*, from his Converting that people, being invited to that work by *Boliſlaus* King of *Polonia*, *An. Chr.* 1124. He at his own charge built fifteen Monaſteries, and preſcribed orders to be obſerved in the Churches founded by him. Several concerned Baptiſm. Among the reſt this (as *Novarinus* informs us from the Hiſtory of his Acts) that when any was to be *baptized*, his Baptiſm was to be diſpatched by a *threefold immerſion* of his head. So, an immerſion there was, and that *three times*, ſetled by him, yet not a total one, not of the whole body, but only a partial one, of the *head*, the principal part.

Spondan. *Epit. Baron. An. Chr.* 1124.

Sacerdos trinâ immerſione capitis *illius myſterii Sacramentum perfecit.* Novarin. *Schediaſm. Sacropropban. l.* 3. *num.* 57. *p.* 82.

§. 89. In the ſame Century (*An. Chr.* 1140.) flouriſhed *Gratian*. And he from the Capitulars, *l.* 5. *c.* 76. cites a direction for any man that hath a mind to have the *Conſecrated water* in his own houſe for *Sprinkling*, (*i. e.* to baptize withal) to

Nullus miniſtrorum qui baptizandi recepit officium, &c.

take it out of the Font before the pouring in of the Chrism. And however that may be interpreted otherwise, though against the meaning of the Author, by such as have a kindness for *Holy water sprinkling*, yet that which follows is clearly to be interpreted of *sprinkling in Baptism*, and shews that this ought so to be interpreted too; being Notes on St. *Cyprians* Epistle to *Magnus*, before cited, of that matter. And here, saith *Gratian* (on St. *Cyprians* words) first is shewn, that the *blessed*, (*i. e. Consecrated*) *water*, wherewith men who are baptized, are *sprinkled*, is of avail to their Sanctification.

Nec quenquam debet movere, quòd aspergi, vel perfundi jubentur ægri, cùm gratiam divinam consequuntur, &c.

Hîc primò ostenditur quòd aqua benedicta *qua homines qui baptizantur asperguntur, valet ad eorum sanctificationem,* Gratian. *Decret. 3. parte de Consecrat. dist. 4. fol. 452. b. col. 4. & litera c. i. e. capitis satis innuit in pluribus locis quòd de* baptismo *intelligitur, & de illis qui propter ægritudinem immergi non possunt. Id. ib.*

§. 90. In the Thirteenth Century the *Magdeburgensian Historians* quote *Hugo* (I suppose they mean him de S. *Caro*) whom *Bellarmin*, as well as *Alsted*, places, *An. Chr.* 1245. for *baptism* not by *total immersion*. And (saith he) if there cannot be had a sufficiency of water for the infant to be *wholly dipt* into it, then let the Baptizer *pour some quantity* of water upon the Infant, with a dish or other vessel, and as he pours it, let him say, *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. And the Infant will be baptized. How? baptized without being dipt? yes, in the Opinion of this Author, a person of Reputation in his time for Judgment and Learning.

Si verò tanta copia aquæ haberi non possit, ut infans in eâ totaliter mergi possit, cum scutello vel Scypho, vel alio vase aliqua quantitas aquæ super infantem effundatur à baptizante, *& fundendo dicat baptizans, Ego baptizo te in nomine patris, & filii & Spiritûs sancti. Et erit infans baptizatus.* Hugo *in 16. in* Johan. *ap.* Magdeb. *cent. 13. col. 596. l. 6, 7.* &c.

§. 91. In

§. 91. In the ſame Century (about *An. Chr.* 1251) the ſaid Authors tell us of a *Synodical* Conſtitution, written by the Biſhop of *Nemans*: wherein 'tis ordained, that as ſoon as ever the *Infant is born*, if there be any *danger of death*, ſo as that it cannot be preſented to the Prieſt, then *any* either man or woman, the very Father, or mother of it (ſo there be no body elſe preſent that can) may baptize it. But in *ſuch neceſſity* who can imagine the Conſtitution intended the *dipping* of the *Infant*? who can think any other, but that Reaſon moved by pity, ſwayed by Charity, and guided by the Cuſtome of the Church, in ſuch caſes, would dictate the more favourable way of *ſprinkling*?

Et in libro ab Epiſcopo Nemanſenſi *conſcripto dicitur, Præcipimus itaque ut infans quàm cito natus fuerit, ſi periculum ſibi mortis immineat, ita quòd Presbytero præſentari nequeat, à circumſtantibus maſculis baptizetur*, &c. Magd. *cent.* 13. *c.* 6. *col.* 594.

§. 92. About the Year of Chriſt, 1255. flouriſhed *Thomas Aquinas*. And he diſputes the caſe whether *immerſion* be of the neceſſity of Baptiſm: and produces Arguments for it, and Anſwers to them. And grounding on what is ſaid by the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 10. 22. *Let us draw near with a true heart in full aſſurance of Faith, having our hearts ſprinkled from an evil Conſcience, and our bodies waſhed with pure water*, he anſwers to the queſtion, that inaſmuch as Water is made uſe of in the Sacrament of Baptiſm for *bodily waſhing*, whereby is ſignified the *inward waſhing* away of ſins; and a waſhing with water may be made not only by way of *immerſion*, but alſo of *aſperſion* or *effuſion*: therefore, though it be the ſafer, becauſe the more common way, to baptize by *dipping*; yet may *a baptiſm* be made by way of *ſprinkling*, or *pouring* on of Water, the way (as he alſo ſaith) S. *Laurence* is ſaid to have baptized. And that this may be done *through neceſſi-*

Cùm in baptiſmo aſſumatur aqua ad corporis ablutionem, non modò per immerſionem verùm etiam per aſperſionem, vel etiam effuſionem aquæ baptiſmus dari poteſt, &c. Aquin. *Sum.* 3. *q.* 66. *art.* 7. *Concluſ. & c. art.*

neceſſity, either by reaſon of the multitude to be baptized, or ſcarceneſs of Water, or feebleneſs of the Miniſter, or weakneſs of the party, whoſe death may be eminently indangered by dipping.

§. 93. His Contemporary *Bonaventure*, yet a little behind him, (*An. Chr.* 1263.) does juſt as he doth, diſputes the queſtion, (*An immergendus, vel tantummodo aſpergendus ſit baptizandus?*) and gives Arguments *pro*, and *con*. But his Anſwer to the queſtion is, that it is preſumed, that the Apoſtles baptized by *ſprinkling*; which way is yet kept in many Churches, and moſt in the *Gallican*. And kept it may be, becauſe therein is the whole Reaſon of the Sacrament; and kept it ought to be in caſe of neceſſity, by reaſon of the weakneſs or timerouſneſs of the Baptizer, the feebleneſs of the party to be baptized, or the ſcarceneſs of Water to baptize withal.

Dicendum quòd præſumitur quòd Apoſtoli baptizaverunt aſpergendo; *& mos ille ſervatur adhuc in pluribus Eccleſiis, & maxime in Eccleſiâ* Gallicanâ. *Servari autem poteſt propter hoc, quòd ibi eſt integra ratio Sacramenti: & ſervari debet cùm neceſſitas imminet.* &c. Bonavent. *l.* 4. *diſt.* 3. *art.* 2. *q.* 2.

§. 94. In this Century the *Magdeburgenſians* tell us of a *Synod* at *Colonia* under the Emperor *Rudolphus*, who was elected to the Empire (*An. Chr.* 1274.) wherein (if it were not rather the *Council of Lyons* held that year) it was decreed, That if there were any fear the *Infant would die before it was born*, ſo *the head did but appear* out of the Womb, the Baptizer ſhould *pour ſuch water* as was preſent upon the head of the child now in the birth, ſaying, *I baptize thee, &c.* Now this, a Synod, eſpecially of ſo many Biſhops (500. if it were the *Concilium Lugdunenſe* that made this decree) would never have ordained, had they not judged the act to be lawful and valid to all intents and pur-

Si timeatur de morte infantis antequam naſcatur, & caput ejuſdem appareat *extra uterum, infundat aquam, quæ adjucrit, ſuper caput naſcentis, dicens, Ego te baptizo*— *Synod. Colon. ſub* Rudolpho *Imperatore, apud* Magdeb *cent.* 13.

purposes; and that there was a *baptism* performed, when to that action was added (and in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) *I baptize thee.*

§. 95. In the same Century the said Authors quote *Gulielmus*, (I suppose they mean *Durantus*) who lived (as *Bellarmin* saith) in the time of Pope *Nicholas* the Third (*An. Chr.* 1280.) and flourished about *An.* 1286. And he speaking of the several ways of Baptizing saith, sometimes Baptism is given by *Immersion*, so that the whole child is dipped in Water. And sometimes it is given by *Aspersion*, when the child is Sprinkled, and water is poured upon him. This is a report from him of what was done in his time. As to what was his own Opinion in the case, I shall report that from the Author himself, whom since the reading of their quotation, and the writing it from them, I have had the opportunity to consult; and he having said concerning the *baptismal ablution*, that it is a *threefold dipping*, or *washing* in baptism, in the name of the *Trinity*; adds this to what he had said, Yet if any be *so sick*, that he cannot without hurt be *thrice dipped*, it is sufficient that he be *thrice sprinkled* with water. He adds also, that if a good big part of the body besides the head, have water poured upon it, or at least the head, the party is held to be baptized; and not otherwise: though some think him baptized, if water do but fall upon his foot.

Quandoque datur per immersionem, *ita quòd totus puer immergitur in aquâ. Quandoque etiam datur per* aspersionem, *quando puer aspergitur, & super eum aqua infunditur.* Guil. Durant. *de ritu baptizandi, c.* 2.

Quintum est baptismi ablutio. *Circa quod notandum est quòd* trina *fit immersio seu lotio in baptismo in nomine* Trinitatis, *&c.* —— *Si tamen quis ita æger sit, ut non possit ter sine læsione immergi, sufficit illum* aquâ aspergi, *ut probatur multipliciter in Canone* Cypriani. *Licèt quidem illud intelligunt de aquæ benedictæ aspersione. Sed & si magna corporis pars præter caput infunditur, vel saltem caput, baptizatus quis reputatur, & non aliter. Licèt quidem etiamsi super pedem aqua ceciderit, reputent baptizatum.* Guil. Durantus *l.* 6. *Rationalis Divinorum Officiorum. Fol.* 148. *col.* 1.

§ 96. In

§. 96. In this Century alſo I ſuppoſe I may place *Johannes Duns Scotus*; but whereabouts I cannot tell: ſo different are the accounts that are given of his time. For *Alſted* places him *Anno* 1300. *Bellarmin* (in his book *de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis*, *pag.* 381.) ſaith he died *An. Dom.* 1380; who yet (in *Chronologiæ parte alterâ*, *pag.* 107.) places him about *An.* 1294. The Author of the *Floſculi Hiſtorici*, about *An.* 1295. *Balæus* ſaith that he died *An.* 1208. I ſuppoſe the figures in *Bellarmin*, and *Bale* are miſtaken, and both ſhould be, 1298. But be that as it will, which is not material to the point, his judgment was for a *ſufficiencie of a Baptiſm by leſs than a total immerſion.* For (ſaith he) if the principal part of a child (not yet wholly born) as *the head*, do appear, that part being baptized ſo, (which cannot be by dipping, but muſt be by Sprinkling, or ſuch like ſhedding of water upon it) the child is fully baptized, nor is he again to be baptized, becauſe in that part there are all mans ſenſes, and conſequently in a manner the whole man. So then with this acute School-man a principal part being baptized, the whole perſon is baptized, which yet could not be, if baptiſm were nothing leſs than the total immerſion of the whole perſon.

Si principalis pars, ut caput, appareat, ſic illa parte baptizata ſimpliciter baptizatur [ſc. puer] nec eſt iterum baptizandus, quia in illa parte ſunt omnes ſenſus humani, & per conſequens totus homo, &c. Joh. Duns Scotus *in ſent. l. 4. diſt. 4. q. 3.*

§. 97. In the Fourteenth Century (*An. Chr.* 1360.) flouriſhed Dr. *William Lynwood*, who wrote Commentaries on the Conſtitutions of ſeveral of our Biſhops. And whereas by the words of a Conſtitution of *Edmund* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, (who dyed as *Bellarmin* ſaith, *an.* 1240, and was Canonized by *Innocent* IVth.) it ſeemed that *baptiſm* ought ſo to be adminiſtred in ſome kind of veſſel, that the party to be baptized might be *dipped* into the water, he tells you, that you are not to underſtand it to be of the *neceſſity of baptiſm*,

Tamen hoc non intelligas de neceſſitate bap-

baptism, that there be *dipping*; but that it may be dispatched by way of *effusion* or *aspersion*, that is *Sprinkling*. And this (saith he) is especially true, when the custome of the Church permits it to be done, or when there is a *necessity* for it, by reason of *want of water*, or *fear of the Childs death*, or weakness of the Priest not able to bear up the Infant. For in these, and the like cases, it is sufficient if the *head be Sprinkled*, or have water poured upon it, or, as being the more principal part, if it be dipped into water. Whether then it be any circumstance in the case that leads thereto, or whether it be the custom of the Church, that is the Inducer unto it, *baptism* however performed, by *pouring or sprinkling* of water on the Party baptized, though he be *not totally dipped*, is, at least in the judgment of this Learned Man, sufficient.

tismi, scilicet ut fiat immersio, *sed potest fieri etiam per modum* effusionis, *vel* aspersionis. *Et hoc maximè est verum, quando* consuetudo Ecclesiæ *hoc patitur, vel quando necessitas incumbit propter* defectum aquæ, *sive* periculum pueri *de cujus morte timetur, vel etiam propter imbecillitatem sacerdotis non potentis sustentare infantem. In his enim casibus & similibus sufficit, quòd* caput aspergatur, *vel* super caput aqua effundatur, *vel in* aquam mergatur *tanquam pars principalior.* Lynwood. *Constitution. l. 3. c. de Baptismo & ejus effectu. super verbum* [*Vas illud*] *in Constitutione* Edmundi.

§. 98. A little after (about *An. Chr.* 1370.) flourished *John Wickliff*, and taught here in *England*. And he, having first declared it an Ordination of the Church, that any believer might in case of *necessity* be baptized; adds thereto, that it mattered not, whether they were *dipped once*, or *thrice*; or whether water were *poured* upon their *heads*; but that every one was to act according to the *custom of the place* he lived in, as well in one lawful rite as in another. By which it is most evident, that he held *pouring of water*

—*Et ordinavit Ecclesiæ quòd quælibet persona fidelis in necessitatis articulo poterit baptizari; nec refert sive* immergantur semel *vel* ter; *sive aquæ* super capita sua effundantur: *sed faciendum est secundùm* consuetudinem lo-

ci, *quem quis incolit, tam in uno legitimo ritu, quàm in alio.* Jo. Wickliff. *Trialog. l. 4. c. 11.*

on the *head* a lawful rite in baptism, as well as *dipping* the body into water: or else he would never have left it so at liberty as he did, to have it done either way, with a *non refert*, it matters not which way it is done. And so how much soever the *Anabaptists* think *Wickliff* was for them, he was not for the necessity of a *total immersion* in baptizing.

§ 99. In the Fifteenth Century (about *An. Chr.* 1452.) flourished *Nicolaus de Orbellis*. And upon the question, whether a Child could be *baptized* whilst in the *Mother's Womb?* he resolves, that if it were *wholly in*, it could *not be baptized*; but that if any principal part, as the *head*, *were out*; it might be *baptized in that part*; and that such *baptizing* was *sufficient* without any more ado. But that baptizing could not be of the whole person: therefore his opinion was, that less than a *total immersion* was sufficient to speak a *complete baptism*. But his own reason which he adds to his opinion will put all out of doubt. For, saith he, it is not probable that, when on the day of *Pentecost* Three Thousand were baptized, every ones Body was washed all over with water (*i. e.* was *dipped*) but his Face only by sprinkling, or his Head by pouring water upon it.

Aut patet pars principalis, puta caput, & tunc potest baptizari in illa parte, & in hoc simpliciter baptizari. Non enim est verisimile quòd in die Pentecostes *quando baptizati sunt tria millia, quòd quilibet lavaretur quantum ad totum corpus suum in aquâ: sed præcisè quantum ad faciem aspergendo, vel quantum ad caput perfundendo.* Nicol. *de Orbellis in 4. Sentent. dist. 4. q. 1. de Baptismo, fol. 10. a.*

§. 100. In this Century (about *An. Chr.* 1480.) flourished *Angelus Clavasius* Author of the *Angelic Summe* of Cases of Conscience. And he, having delivered the several Opinions there were, as to the manner of *baptizing*, one holding that all was to be washed, another the *head*, or face, or breast, declares at last, what the opinion

nion was, which was most commonly held, namely that the *Infant*, which way soever he be touched [*i.e.* with the *water*] was baptized: and that a *sprinkling*, how *little* soever it were, was sufficient in case of necessity.

Tenetur tamen communis [*sc. sententia*] *quod qualitercunque contingatur, est baptizatus: & quòd sufficiat aspersio quantumcunque modica in casu necessitatis. Angel. de Clavasio, Summa Angelica. fol. 25. b --- col. 2.*

§. 101. In this Century, towards the latter end of it, flourished *Guil. Vorrilong*: So I suppose, because his Book was printed at *Venice*, *Anno* 1502. And, in case part of a Child in the Birth appeared out of the Womb, whilst part was within, if that part which appeared out was a principal part, as the *head*, his opinion was, that then the Child might be baptized by an application of *water* to that part, and was not after to be *baptized* again. Which clearly shews, that he held a baptizing by other than a *total immersion*, lawful and sufficient.

Sed dicitur quòd puer partim sit in utero, & pars extrà baptizetur, nunquid est baptizatus? V. Dicendum quòd si pars principalis est extra ut caput, tunc potest baptizari: nec est postmodum rebaptizandus. Guil. Vorrilong. in l. 4. Sent. dist. 4. fol. 126. col. 1. Edit. Venet. An. 1503.

§. 102. In the Sixteenth Century, to pass by the Christians of St. *Thomas* in *India*, and the *Habassins* in *Africa*, who baptize their Infants sooner than the time of Forty days, if there be any danger of their dying before; which so great care for their Souls, cannot be without some care for their Bodies, which would little appear, if for the saving of the one, they should unnecessarily destroy the other; and so is, like other examples of the same sort, an intimation at least of a baptism by other gentler ways, than that of a total immersion among those Christians. We are told by *Johannes Faber*, in an Epistle of his to *Ferdinand* King of the *Romans*, dated (*An.* 1525.) concerning the *Muscovites*, that they

Cùm puer fortioribus naturæ viribus appareat,

baptize

ter totus immergitur, *alioquin*, aquâ tingitur, *raro tamen: conspersio enim minus sufficiens judicatur. De Russorum, Tartarorum & Moscovitarum Religione, pag.* 176.

baptize *their Infants*, if strong, by a *three-fold immersion*, else by a tinging or *sprinkling* them with water, though this latter way they do use but seldom, as holding sprinkling not altogether so sufficient. Now these having received their Religion, as they say of themselves, from St. *Andrew*; and being very firm to what they have once received, as he saith of them, may be an instance of a baptizing by pouring on of water, as well as by putting into water, not only for the time that Author writ in, but for all the time since the first reception of their Religion, which may, for ought I know, reach up to the Apostles days; and does so, if their own Tradition be true; and why it may not, may perhaps be more than every one can tell.

Tunc Sacerdos puerum sinistræ manui suæ impositum teneat supra fontem, & manu dextrâ de fonte hauriens aquam fundat super caput *pueri* tribus vicibus: *ita quòd aqua tangat caput & scapulas, dicens* Ego te baptizo in nomine patris, *fundat semel capite ad Orientem verso.* Et filii, *secundò superfundat aquam Baptismi, capite verso ad Aquilonem*: Et Spiritûs Sancti, *fundat tertiò, capite verso ad meridiem. Notandum circà Baptismum, sive ipse actus baptizandi fiat per* trinam immersionem, *sive per* trinam superinfusionem *aquæ, utrumque ritum & modum Ecclesia*

§. 103. Of the manner of baptizing in the Archbishoprick of *Mentz*, we have an account given in the *Agenda* of that Church, published by *Sebastian* Arch-Bishop of that *See*, *An. Dom.* 1551. and that is, that the Priest holding the Child over the Font in his left hand, shall take water out of the Font with his right hand, and *pour* it upon the *head* of the *Child three times*. Nor is there only this Order given, but a Note also added, declaring the *indifferency* of both the Ceremonies *Immersion* and *Superinfusion*, neither way varying the Essence of Baptism, and both ways being received by the Church: whose custome in either is to be observed: though on diverse accounts *pouring on of water* is judged more expedient

expedient than dipping into it: and that practice justified by the example of the Apostles, St. *Laurence*, *Remigius*, and divers others.

recepit. Utrùm autem semel aut ter immergatur, aut si aquâ superinfundatur tertiò, non variat Baptismi essentiam: Ita tamen ut Ecclesiæ consuetudo observetur, quam non observans peccat. Magis tamen amplectendum, si aliàs illius Ecclesiæ fuerit consuetudo, quòd ter aquâ superinfundatur. Si enim Sacerdos sit senex, aut tremulus habens manus, aut si sit vehemens frigus. si infans sit debilis, aut adultus, aut perfectioris ætatis, qui commodè immergi non possunt: expedit, ut per infusionem aquæ fiat, & non per immersionem. Cujus rei exemplum trahimus ab Apostolis, Sancto Laurentio, Remigio, *cæterisque plurimis, qui aspergendo & superinfundendo aquam baptizabant. Sic sanctus* Laurentius *urceo aquæ superinfuso baptizavit* Romanum. *Sic etiam* Remigius *Regem* Franciæ *baptizavit. Quare ne ritus alius ad sanos, alius ad infirmos, alius ad pueros, alius ad adultos varietur, sed unus permaneat modus: expedit, ut hujus Sacramenti ministri* tutiorem *amplexantes* modum, *superinfundendo ter baptizent, nisi consuetudo contrarium habeat. Agenda Ecclesiæ Moguntinensis per Reverendiss. in Christo Patrem*, &c. *Dom.* Sebastianum *Archiep. Moguntin. & Princip. Electorem. Edit. Moguntiæ, Anno* 1551. *fol.* 22, 23.

§. 104. Of the *Russian* manner of baptizing I find different accounts given. According to one relation made by Dr. *Giles Fletcher* (*An. Dom.* 1588.) the manner is, that after certain prayers, the Priest *plungeth the child thrice over head and ears*. For this, as that Relator saith, they hold to be plain necessary, that no part of the child be undipped. But according to another account given in another relation (*An. Dom.* 1557.) recorded by *Purchas*, the manner is, that when the *water is sanctified*, the Priest taketh the child, and holdeth it in a small Tub, and one of the Godfathers taketh the Pot with warm water, and poureth it all upon the childs head. And with this in part agrees that Relation which was made in an Epistle written to *David Chytræus*, (dated *Aug.* 1. 1576) wherein 'tis shewn, that their

Purchas. Pilgrim. part. 3. *pag.* 451.

Purchas Pilgrim part. 3. *pag.* 229.

Post longas tandem Cæremonias Flamen to-

manner of baptizing their Infants, was by *pouring a large quantity of water on them. The Priest (as saith that Author relating the manner of their baptizing) useth to pour a *whole gallon of water* upon the Infant, saying, *I baptize thee, &c.* So that, according to this relation, pouring on of water is with them a baptizing. And for the diversities of the Relations, they may easily be reconciled, by considering, that they might be founded in the different accounts, that in different times and places, might be given to the Relators; that thing being in use at one time, which was not in another, and that in one place, which was not in another; as it were easie, were it needful, to prove by instance without going half so far as *Russia* for the proof of it: indifferent rites and customs in the Church, being quickly taken up, or laid down, as the Pleasure of the Governours, or Fancy of the people is.

to congio perfundere solet infantem, ita inquiens, Baptizo te, &c. Lib. de Russorum, Moscovitarum, & Tartarorum Religione, pag. 240.

§. 105. And truly as the general custom now in *England* is to Sprinkle, so in the fore end of this Centurie the general custom was to dip. And yet at the same time in *Belgia* it was the manner to baptize by pouring of water on. Thence that Note set in the Margin of St. *Cyprians* Epistle to *Magnus* in the Edition of that Author set forth by *Erasmus*, and Printed at *Leyden*, by *Gryphius*, *An.* 1537. *Perfunduntur apud nos, merguntur apud Anglos, i. e.* They are sprinkled or baptized by the pouring of water on, in our Country, they are dipped in *England*; that is, as I suppose, some were so baptized, and perhaps the greater number,

Deinde accipiat sacerdos infantem per latera in manibus suis, & interrogato nomine ejus baptizet eum sub trinâ mersione, tantùm sanctam Trinitatem invocando, ita dicens [N. Et ego baptizo te in nomine patris] *& mergat eum semel versa facie ad aquilonem, & capite versus orientem* [& filii] *& iterum mergat semel versa facie ad meridiem* [& Spiritus Sancti. Amen] *& mergat tertiò rectâ facie versus aquam. Tunc Patrini accipientes infantem de*

number, though others, whose weakness required more favourable dealing with them, were sprinkled; which within the time of half a Century prevailed to be the more general, as now it is almost the only way of baptizing. And no marvel, when as by the *Rubric* of that Office, (as the Administration of it was setled by Queen *Elizabeth*, and by King *Edward* the Sixth before her) whereas dipping was the appointed way of baptizing, yet it was declared, that if the Child were weak, it should suffice to pour water upon it. And when the liberty of Sprinkling was allowed, what tender mother would not think her new-born child too weak to endure to be dipped? especially if once some instance really were, or were but fancied, and famed, of some childs taking cold, or being otherwise prejudiced by its being dipped. And when withal some learned Persons of the Nation declared for the lawfulness of baptizing otherwise than by dipping: of whom, for an instance, I shall name one without exception, and that is Dr. *Whitaker*, who flourished a little after the middle of this Century dying in the year of our Lord, 1595.

manibus Sacerdotis levent cum de Fonte. Manuale ad Usum Ecclesiæ Sarisburiensis, fol. 41. b. Edit. An. 1530.

Then the Priest shall take the child in his hands and ask the Name. And Naming the Child, sh ll dip it in the Water Thrice: first dipping the right side, secondly the left side, the third time dipping the Face toward the Font, so it be discreetly and warily done, saying, *N. I baptize thee, &c.* And if the Child be weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the foresaid words. K. *Edwards* Com. Prayer-book of the first Edition Printed, *An.* 1549.

§. 106. And though that then learned, and still famous man, Master of St. *John's* Colledge in *Cambridge*, and the Kings Professor of Divinity in that University, do say that βαπτισμὸς and βάπτισμα signifie immersion, and thinks immersion the

Βαπτισμὸς aut βάπτισμα immersionem significat, quia olim qui adulti baptizabantur, non leviter aquâ tinsti aut aspersi fuerunt, sed immersi; & quibusdam

 better

in locis ter immersi: qui mos in Ecclesiâ diu permansit— Alia tamen locorum & populorum quorundam consuetudo fuit, ubi unctione contenti, quam sufficere putabant, immersionem non desiderabant.

Quanquam autem in adultis & sanis immersionem meliorem esse putem, tamen sufficere *in* parvulis & clinicis aspersionem *arbitror. Nam Christus jussit βαπτίζειν, non modum præscripsit: βαπτίζειν verò non* immergere *tantùm significat, sed & tingere, etsi nusquam, quòd sciam, aspergere, nam illud est ῥαντίζειν. Dr.* Whitaker *Prælection. de Sacram. de Baptismo. qu. 1. c. 2. p. 216.*

Cæterùm mergatúrne totus qui tingitur, idque ter an semel, an infusâ tantùm aquâ aspergatur, minimum refert: sed id pro regionum diversitate Ecclesiis liberum esse debet. Quanquam & ipsum Baptizandi verbum mergere significat, & mergendi ritum veteri Ecclesiæ observatum fuisse constat. Calvin. *Inst. l. 4. c. 14. Sect. 19. fol. 443. Hîc perspicimus quisnam apud veteres*

better way for those that are of *grown Age*, and in Health (wherein I believe he is not alone) yet he thinks Sprinkling sufficient for *little Children*, and such as *keep their beds*; adding that for a reason, which is much to the purpose, namely, because *Christ did command to baptize, but did not prescribe the manner of baptizing*; and that βαπτίζειν did signifie, not only to *dip*, but to *wet*, though it did not, that he knew of, signifie to *sprinkle*, that being ῥαντίζειν, another word. Thus we have this learned man declaring his judgment and in his Lectures too, for a sufficiency of Sprinkling for *children*, and *sick persons*; and that grounded on a *no prescription of the manner* of baptizing by Christ the Ordainer of the Sacrament of baptism, which is as much as can be desired to be said by any.

§. 107. And no wonder if that Custom prevailed at home, which our *Reformed Divines* in the time of the *Marian* persecution, had found to be the judgment of other Divines, and seen to be the practice of other Churches abroad: and especially of Mr. *Calvin*, and his Church at *Geneva*. For that great and leading man, Mr. *Calvin*, whose glory needs not my Taper to shew it to the world, as illustriously shining therein by its own native light, (whose time was about *An. Chr.* 1535.) though he grant

grant the verb βαπτίζω to signifie to *dip*, and say it for a certainty, that the rite of dipping was observed by the ancient Church, yet he saith it is not *material* at all, whether he that is baptized be *totally dipped*, and that once or thrice; or whether he be only *sprinkled* with water poured on him: but that it ought to be free for the Churches to do as they think good in that, according to the diversity of Countries wherein they are. In this learned Man's judgment then sprinkling is lawful, notwithstanding the signification of the word, and use of the Church to dip, unless, as I suppose he means, though he mention it not, in case of necessity, wherein it appears to have been the custom to sprinkle, *&c.* or else it could not be free for Churches to use it. Yea in the Form of Administration of Baptism written by this Great Man, for the Church of *Geneva*, the way of baptizing, as it is there by him set down, is by pouring out of water on the Infant to be baptized.

baptizandi ritus fuerit: totum enim corpus in aquam immergebant: nunc invaluit usus, ut minister corpus vel caput tantùm aspergat. Calvin. *in Act. Apost. c.* 8. *v.* 38. *p.* 144. *a. Promissione fidei nomen infanti imponitur: tum in eum aquam Baptismi minister effundit, inquiens, N. Baptizo te, &c.* Calvin. *Tract. Theolog. de Baptismo, p.* 45.

§. 108. Contemporary with *Calvin*, and somewhat before him, was *Martin Bucer*, flourishing about *An. Chr.* 1520. And he tells us, that *God commended unto men such a rite, as that by either the tinction, ablution, or aspersion of water they should receive remission of sins, and that by the publick Ministers of the religions, and lastly would always have them begin his worship with this, because he would have the prime and principal point of our salvation, the belief of remission of sins, that is of free justification, by that means confirmed unto men, and more powerfully*

Porro quòd Deus ejusmodi ritum hominibus commendavit, ut aquæ vel tinctione vel ablutione, aut aspersione peccatorum à se ablutionem acciperent, & eam per publicos religionum administros, & hinc denique suum cultum semper auspicarentur, causa est, quòd initium & caput

stirred

ſalutis noſtræ, fidem remiſſionis peccatorum, hoc eſt gratuitæ juſtificationis confirmare hominibus eo pacto, & excitare voluerit. M. Bucer. *enarrat. Ep.* Pauli *ad* Roman. *c.* 6. *p.* 289. *Edit.* 1536.

ſtirred up. His ſpeaking ſo indifferently of all theſe ways of baptizing, tinction, ablution, and aſperſion, ſpeaks his allowance and approbation of every one.

§. 109. But not *Calvin* only, and the Men of his judgment, were ſo minded, but Perſons alſo of a different perſwaſion from him, and that both at home and abroad. For inſtance, *Herman* Arch-Biſhop of *Colen*, for the Reformation of his Dioceſe held a Provincial Council in the Year of our Lord, 1536. for which he was after by the Emperor forced to leave his Biſhoprick. In that Council the Canon, which concerns the baptizing of Infants, is delivered in ſuch terms, as ſpeak differing ways of baptizing, *viz.* either by *immerging*, or by *tinging*, that is, by dipping or ſprinkling, (or otherwiſe wetting than by dipping) in uſe in that Church. It adds alſo, that the thrice repeated immerſion or tinction, expreſſes a type of our Lord's three days Sepulture or burial. Now it is plain, that though *tingo*, where it ſtands alone, doth not denote any particular way of baptizing, but notes baptizing in general, without reference to any particular way of it, and is ſo uſed in the writings of Church Authors both ancient, and Modern; yet when it is ſet with *immergo*, and in contradiſtinction to it, then it notes another way of baptizing than that, whether by aſperſion, affuſion, or perfuſion, and not dipping, as I have before ſufficiently ſhewed, *Ch.* 3. *S.* 6, 7. And it muſt do ſo here unleſs we will in ſo few words make a ridiculous tautology,

Ter verò infans vel immergitur, vel tingitur aquâ baptiſmatis. —

Tertiò quoque repetita immerſio vel tinctio typum triduanæ domini ſepulturæ exprimit, per quam Chriſto conſepulti ſumus in baptiſmo; & cum Chriſto reſurreximus in fide, ut à peccatis abluti, in ſanctitate virtutum vivamus, imitando Chriſtum. Canon. Concil. Provincial. Colonienſ. ſub Hermanno *celebrati, Anno* 1536.

as

as if the Council had ſaid, But the Infant is thrice *either dipped*, or *dipped*: which would be very little becoming the gravity of ſo wiſe and learned a Council as that was. And *tingitur* cannot be here ſaid to be added to *immergitur* by way of exegeſis, or explication; for it is the particular that is to explain and determine the general, and not the general the particular. And if but one and the ſame thing had been meant by both the words, it muſt have been, The Infant is *tinged*, or *dipped*; not *dipped*, or *tinged*. Beſides *dipping* is a word of a more known and determinate uſe than *tinging* is. And 'twere abſurd to explain *notum per ignotius*, a more known term, by a term of whoſe import there was leſs knowledge. And ſo here is a fair evidence for a baptiſm by other than a total immerſion in that Church.

§. 110. And thus at home, in the Year 1558. *Thomas Watſon* Biſhop of *Lincoln* publiſhed a Volume of Sermons about the Sacraments: in the fourth of which (*fol.* 226.) he ſaith, concerning the matter in hand, *although the old and ancient Tradition of the Church hath been from the beginning to dip the Child three times in the water, as Chriſt lay three Days in the Grave, yet that is not of ſuch neceſſity, but that if he be but once dipped in the water it is ſufficient: yea and in time of great peril and neceſſity, if the water be but poured on the head, it will ſuffice.*

§. 111. About that time flouriſhed *Wolfgangus Muſculus*, a Man of great Learning, and equal Modeſty. And he *An. Chr.* 1560. publiſhed his *Common Places* of Divinity, wherein, when he comes to ſpeak of the manner, how baptiſm ought to be adminiſtred, he ſaith, as to the *immerſion* of the Infant that is to be baptized, we do not judge it ſo neceſſary, as that the Churches may not be at liberty to baptize either by *dipping* or *ſprinkling*. And then goes on to prove

Poſtremò, quod immerſionem infantis attinet, judicamus hanc non ſic eſſe neceſſariam, ut non ſit liberum Eccleſiis baptizare vel mergendo vel aſpergendo. Libertatem hanc ſervatam eſſe in Eccleſiis videre eſt in Auguſtino *de Eccleſiaſticis dogmatibus* (more

truly *Gennadius* was that Author) *c.* 74. & Cypriano, *l.* 4. *Ep.* 7.

prove that this liberty had been kept in the Churches, by two teſtimonies (already mentioned) from St. *Auguſtin*, and St. *Cyprian*. This was the judgment of this Man worth a World, as I have ſomewhere read him reckoned.

§. 112. Much about the ſame time, or a little after, *Ann. Chr.* 1565. flouriſhed *Martin. Chemnitius*. And he tells us that St. *Paul*, the beſt Interpreter of what is meant by βαπτίζειν, ſaith, that *to baptize is to cleanſe or purge by the waſhing of water with the Word*. Therefore (concludes he thence) whether the waſhing be performed by *merſion*, *tinction*, *perfuſion*, or *aſperſion*, it is a baptizing: for it is a purgation or cleanſing by the waſhing of water. Nor unto this waſhing is neceſſarily required an immerſion under Water——: And again, The command of Chriſt is, that there be in Baptiſm a purification or cleanſing by the waſhing of Water. But how that cleanſing ought to be made, whether by *dipping*, *tinging*, *pouring on*, or *ſprinkling*, Chriſt hath not preſcribed. So then at great liberty is the Church of Chriſt in this caſe, to baptize which way ſhe pleaſes, by dipping, or ſprinkling, or otherwiſe, and all without ſin; at leaſt in the judgment of this Learned Author, the Tridentine Council's ſevere Examiner.

Sed Paulus *certiſſimus interpres dicit* baptizare *eſſe* mundare, *ſeu* purgare *per lavacrum in verbo. Sive igitur per* ablutionem *quæ fiat adhibitâ aquâ, Eph.* 5. *Tit.* 3. *Act.* 2. *ſive adhibitio aquæ fiat* mergendo, tingendo, perfundendo *ſeu* aſpergendo, *eſt baptizatio: eſt enim* purgatio, *ſeu* ablutio *per* lavacrum aquæ. *Nec ad lavacrum neceſſariò requiritur immerſio ſub aquam——. Chriſti igitur mandatum eſt, ut in baptiſmo fiat purificatio ſeu ablutio per lavacrum aquæ. Quo verò modo illa fieri debeat, ſive mergendo, tingendo, perfundendo, ſive aſpergendo, Chriſtus non præſcripſit.* Chemnitii *Exam. Concil. Trident. part.* 2. *p.* 122. *a.*

§. 113. In

§. 113. In the year 1586. was printed at *Wirtzburg*, the *Confessors Manual* by *Martinus ab Azpilcueta*, and as in his opinion there must be an ablution in Baptism, so the wetting of but a little part, and that but with a little water, is sufficient to speak the party baptized.

Adde quòd ad hoc, ut aliquis sit verè baptizatus, sufficit quòd quantulacunque pars ejus tingatur aquâ quamlibet modicâ, &c. Martin. ab Azpilcueta, *Dr.* Navarrus, *Confession Manual. c. 22. n. 7. p. 693.*

§. 114. About the year of our Lord, 1589 flourished *Nicolaus Hemingius*, and published his Commentary on St. *John*. And (saith he there) as oft as we see *Infants sprinkled* with the water of baptism, we are put in mind of the *secret regeneration* of Infants, *&c.* No need of arguing hence either the practice of his time to have been to *sprinkle* in Baptism; or his opinion of the lawfulness and sufficiency of such baptizing; since it was symbolical of that *secret regeneration* that inwardly was wrought by the Holy Spirit.

Quoties igitur videmus Infantes aquâ Baptismi aspergi, *admonemur* arcanæ regenerationis *infantium quæ fit, non per aquam elementarem, sed per spiritum sanctum, cujus tamen aqua elementaris efficax symbolum est.* Heming. *in* Joh. 3. 5. *col.* 132, 133.

§. 115. A little lower down in this Century was *Lambertus Danæus*, a learned Author: who (about *An. Chr.* 1591.) published his *Isagoge Christiana*. And having declared the ancient manner of baptizing to have been by *dipping*, and that naked, he saith, At this day, they who are to be baptized are mostly sprinkled only with water, and not dipped into it. Wherein yet (he adds) there is no disagreement in Faith between us and the Ancients. His reason he had given before, which was, that

Hodie autem aquâ ferè tantùm asperguntur qui sunt baptizandi, non autem immerguntur. In quo ipso nulla est in fide dissentio inter nos & veteres. Lamb. Dan. *Isagog. Christian. pars 4. de Sacramentis, c. 29. pag. 522.*

Nam in baptismi administratione alia sunt aut substantialia, aut Ceremonialia, aut Accidentalia. Substantialia sunt aqua, & illius ap-

Substan-

plicatio, &c. Ceremonialia ſunt reliqua. Ac ſubſtantialia quidem neque poſſunt, neque debent prætermitti, vel immutari. At Ceremonialia poſſunt immutari, quædam etiam prætermitti, quædam etiam omnino rejici & repudiari debent. Id. ib. p. 521.

Subſtantials of Baptiſm, as water, and an application of it, might neither be omitted, nor changed: but the *Ceremonials* (as the manner of applying the water by affuſion or immerſion, and that once or thrice are) may be changed.

Hîncque ritum baptizandi, ſub trina immerſione *vel* aſperſione, *ſervavit Eccleſia, ut ex* Romanæ *Eccleſiæ Sacerdotali apparet. — Et conſtat quòd in Eccleſiæ* Romanæ *Provinciis* aſperſione *ſeu* perfuſione *aquæ baptiſmus confertur, quod nec novum, nec recens eſt. Legimus quendam à S.* Laurentio, *dum ad mortem ducebatur, urceo allato baptizatum fuiſſe. S.* Cyprian. *Ep. 76. ad Magn. Nec quenquam movere debet, quòd* aſpergi *vel* perfundi *videntur ægri, cùm gratiam dominicam conſequuntur. Notandum, ait* Walafrid. Strabo *de Reb. Eccleſ. c. 26. non ſolùm mergendo, ſed etiam deſuper fundendo multos baptizatos fuiſſe, & adhuc poſſe baptizari, &c.* — Joh. Stephan. Durantus *de Ritib. Eccleſ. Catbol. l. 1. c. 19. num. 37 p. 135.*

§. 116. In the year 1592. was publiſhed by *Joh. Stephan. Durantus*, a Book of the Rites of the Catholick Church. Therein he declares how the Church of *Rome* had to that time kept (*but he ſays not how long before it had held*) the Rite of baptizing with a *threefold dipping*, or *ſprinkling*: and that in the Provinces of the Church of *Rome* baptiſm is given by *ſprinkling* or pouring on of water: which he affirms to be no new thing, nor lately come up; and backs his affirmation, with the example of St. *Laurence*, and the Authorities of *Walafrid Strabo*, and St. *Cyprian*. In this teſtimony there ſeems to be great weight, every circumſtance conſidered; whether the Dignity of that Church, wherein it was, the Church of *Rome*, the leading Church of the World for many Ages; or the Diffuſedneſs of it, not only through that Church, but the Provinces alſo of it; or the Antiquity of it, from *Strabo*'s time, from St. *Laurences* time, from St. *Cyprians* time

time (who was martyred about *An. Chr.* 258.) nay no beginning is set to its being in the Church of *Rome*, as if it had been there held in practice from the beginning. Which (being the contrary thereto cannot be proved,) is with me an Argument of weighty force: and how slightly soever some may look upon it, yet others I hope, of cooler temper, may think it to be of some moment.

Edit. Colon. Agrippina, 1592.

§. 117. Much about the same time, or a little after (*An. Chr.* 1598.) flourished *Daniel Chamier*; a person whose learning needs none of my pen to commend it. And his opinion was, that forasmuch as the whole virtue of the water lay in signifying by washing, it mattered not how much every one was washed; even as in the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* it did not matter how much every one did eat. Then with him it was not material whether the baptism were by *immersion*, *affusion*, or *aspersion*, so there were but water, and any way an ablution with it.

Quia tota virtus aquæ est in significando per ablutionem, certè non interest quantum quisque *abluatur*, *quomodo in* Eucharistia non quantum *quisque comedat*. Jan. Chamier. *l. 5. de Bapt. c. 1. p. 1404. parag. 4.*

§. 118. In the beginning of this Seventeenth Century now current (*anno* 1606.) Mr. *Atterſol* published his Treatise of the Sacraments. And touching the Point in hand he delivereth his opinion thus. ‘*Dipping* into the ‘water is not necessary to the being ‘of a Sacrament: *Sprinkling* of wa- ‘ter is not necessary to the being of ‘a Sacrament: but *wetting* and *wash*- ‘*ing* with water is necessary to the being of a Sacrament. ‘Now whether the whole body should be washed, or the ‘face only: and whether it should be done once or thrice, ‘is not greatly material, but left indifferent to the Church ‘to decree and determine, what shall be thought fittest to ‘be received and practised.

Lib. 2. ch. 1. p. 108, 109.

§. 119. In

§. 119. In the year 1603. was Printed (*Colon. Agrippin.*) Cardinal *Tolets* Cases of Conscience. And therein he delivers it as necessary, that there be an *ablution* of the body of the baptized with *water*. But then he tells you, that by *ablution* is meant either *immersion* (once, or thrice) or *aspersion*, or *effusion*; and that which of these ways soever it be done, the Baptism holds good, *&c.*

Materia propinqua est ablutio: *est enim opus, quod abluat corpus Nota tamen quòd per* ablutionem *intelligimus vel* immersionem *sive* unam sive trinam, *vel* aspersionem, *vel* effusionem: *quocunque modo horum fiat, tenet baptismus. Tamen quisque debet baptizare, juxta ritum suæ Ecclesiæ, nisi aliud petat necessitas, vel honestas. Necessitas quidem, ut in loco, ubi est trina, vel una immersio, cùm est periculum nocumenti infantis, potest aspergi, vel paucâ aquâ suffundi. Honestas, ut, si adultus est, non debet immergi, sed sufficit effusio.* Tolet. *Instruct. Sacerdot. l.* 28. *p.* 372, 373.

§ 120. In the Year 1611. was Printed at *Tubing*, *Hafenreffars* Common Places, wherein, though he grant that *Baptizo* doth signifie to *dip*, yet he saith, it matters not at all, whether the Baptized be *dipped*, or *sprinkled* with water, and whether on the forehead, breast, or whole body.

Quid de immersione sentiendum, nam Baptizare significat immergere? Nihil prorsus refert, sive immergantur, *sive* aspergantur *aquâ qui baptizantur. Sicut & illud planè Adiaphorum est, utrum unâ, duabus vel tribus vicibus id fiat, & sive* fronte, *sive* pectore, *sive* corpore toto. *Quia nullum ea de re Verbum aut Mandatum divinum extat. Modo* Aqua *secundum Institutionem debiti ratione adhibeatur.* Hafenreffar. *Theolog. Loc. l.* 3. *Loc.* 7. *de Sacrament. p.* 493.

§. 121. And thus without adding more, we have seen the judgment and practice of our *Particular Church*, agreeing with the judgment and practice of the *Church Catholick*, in all the former Ages of it. That the Church hath ever allowed of other Baptisms, besides a *total immersion*, and upon befitting occasions hath admitted of them.

That

That the Church hath never declared any unlawfulness to be in other ways of baptizing, besides that of a *total dipping*, nor pronounced the baptisms of such to be null and void, as were otherwise baptized. Let the *Council*, either *General*, or but *Provincial*, be produced, wherein any such *Decree* hath passed, and it shall have all becoming respect paid unto it. And can now any man, that owns any degree of Communion with the *Catholick Church*, be so *uncatholick*, (not to say *Unchristian*) as to charge upon that Church so high a crime, as to continue, through all the Ages of it, so gross an Error in it, as baptizing by other ways than a *total immersion* is made, without so much as attempting the Reformation of it; yea, suffering it by degrees to gain such ground in it, as to become at length the General, almost the Universal practice of it? Can any man think that Church so deserted of the Spirit of Christ, and the gracious influences of his assisting presence, as not to be able to discern an error to be in this practice, if there were one? Or can any man think her so deficient in her fidelity to Christ, and care to keep what hath been committed to her, as not to have disowned it, opposed it, and condemned it, if she had judged any erroneousness to have been in it? She that hath appeared so brisk and vigorous in her oppositions of other errors, as to resist them even unto Bloud, enduring the sharpest and heaviest of persecutions, rather than give way in the least unto them, how came she to be so stanch and tame in this, as calmly and coolly to let it slide along in her, from Age to Age, without giving the least stop or check unto it, or so much as setting any brand of infamy, or even remark of dislike upon, precisely upon the account of its being such? What? are all Baptisms, but *total immersions*, mere nullities? nay worse, mockages, and abusings; yea frauds and cheats, put upon the parties baptized? and would never a Church, never a Council, never a Father, once in so many years appear, in one Decree, in one Canon, in one Homily, in one Condemnation of them, and

in

in vindication of the one only lawful, effectual way of baptizing? What? had they all lost their senses? all their courages? all their honesties? that there should be never a one to stand up for the truth, and bid battel unto so pernicious an error? What? the *Catholick Church* turning Conspirator against it self, and contriving or conniving at a way of bringing members into it self, which must in the issue prove a turning of it self out of the Church, and a returning of it into the state of Heathen, or a condition next it? Let man endued with reason admit of so wild a thought if he can. He must efface all rationality from off his Soul, that can think any other, but that the Church in this concern hath demeaned her self with all integrity, neither acting therein without judgment, nor yet against her judgment. And if the *Catholick Church* be so innocent, then the Church of *England* cannot be guilty, which walks but in Communion with her, in the same judgment, and in the same practice.

CHAP. XI.

Answers to Authorities produced to the contrary, by Mr. Danvers, from divers Grammarians, Divines, *and* other Writers.

§. 1. BUT methinks I see an Army of *Authors* drawn up in Battalia, by a *Major* in Arts as well as Arms, and standing ready to attack my Hypothesis. I will first clear the way of them, and then pass on to other matter. And I am the more encouraged to the encounter, in regard I discern few, or no *Voluntiers* among them, but most, or all *Prest-men*: which, when disengaged from the force put upon them by their

Mr. Danvers *Treat. of Bapt. Part. 2. ch. 4.*

their *Commander*, may hap to face about and be for us, or at leaſt to march off, without doing any thing at all on either ſide.

§. 2. And the firſt that appear are *Scapula* and *Stephens*, 'two (as Mr. *D.* tells us) as great Maſters of the Greek 'Tongue as any we have (and alſo great Defenders of 'Infants Baptiſm) and they (as he ſaith) do tell us in 'their Lexicons, that βαπτίζω from βάπτω ſignifies *mer-* 'go, immergo, ſubmergo, obruo, item tingo, quod fit im- 'mergendo, inficere, imbuere, viz. To dip, plunge, over- 'whelm, put under, cover over, to die in colour, which 'is done by plunging.

§. 3. If (ſay I) they be ſo great Maſters of the Greek Tongue, then it is fit that their word be of ſuitable Authority with thoſe that appeal to them; and in one thing as well as in another: elſe the Appellants take the Authority out of their hands, and make themſelves the Judges of thoſe, whoſe judicature they appeal unto. If that may be, things will do well enough. For then as we are to believe them, when they ſay that βαπτίζω ſignifies more *eſpecially to dip*, ſo alſo when they ſay, that it ſignifies more *generally* to *waſh*. And that they both do, though Mr. *D.* is not pleaſed to take notice of any ſuch thing.

§. 4. For *Scapula*, having firſt rendred βαπτίζω by *mergo, ſeu immergo, ut quæ tingendi, aut abluendi gratiâ aquæ immergimus*, and again, *mergo, ſubmergo, obruo aquâ*, addes, *Item*, (and it is an *item* fit to be adverted unto) *abluo, lavo*, to cleanſe with waſhing, (and in general) to waſh. So then by the judgment of this great Maſter of the Greek Tongue, βαπτίζω ſignifies, not only *ſtrictly* to *dip*, but alſo more *largely* to *waſh*: and then a baptiſm may be ſaid to be, where there is a *waſhing*, though there be no *dipping*.

§. 5. Then for *Stephanus*, having firſt (as did *Scapula*, who *verbatim* tranſcribes *Stephanus*) rendred βαπτίζω by *mergo, ſeu inmergo, ut quæ tingendi, aut abluendi gratiâ aquæ intingimus*, and again *mergo, id eſt, ſubmergo, obruo aquâ*,

aquâ, he afterwards adds (as *Scapula* from him hath done) βαπτίζω, *abluo*, *lavo*; and after all renders βαπτισμὸς and βάπτισμα by *merſio*, *lotio*, *ablutio*. So then with him, as with the other great Maſter of the *Greek* Tongue, to baptize is not only ſtrictly to *dip*, but more largely to *waſh*; and baptizing is not only in ſtrictneſs *dipping*, but in general *any waſhing*. And thus much for theſe two.

§. 6. The next Mr. *Danvers* quotes is *Grotius*. 'And '(ſaith he) *Grotius* tells us, it ſignifies *to dip over head and* 'ears.

§. 7. Like enough: but we are not told where, that we might ſee, whether, if he ſay ſo, he do not ſay ſomething more. And all he ſaith, being granted, ſignifies nothing, unleſs he had ſaid, it *always* ſignifies ſo, and never (either in profane, or ſacred Authors) any thing other, or leſs than ſo. But that is not ſaid: and this great Man's ſaying, without that, ſtands but like a Cypher without a Figure.

§. 8. *Paſor* comes next, and tells, as Mr. *D.* informs us, 'that it ſignifies, *an Immerſion*, *Dipping*, or *Submer*-'*ſion*.

§. 9. But either *Paſor* ſaith not ſo: or elſe my eyes are ſo bad, that they cannot, no not with the help of Spectacles, read thoſe words in him. In *Pag.* 133. he renders βάπτισμα by *baptiſma*, and *per Metaph. Affliction*; and *pag.* 134. βαπτισμὸς *lotio* and *baptiſmus*: but not a word of what he is quoted for. But perhaps the meaning is, that βαπτίζω ſignifies an *Immerſion*, *Dipping*, or *Submerſion*. He doth indeed render βαπτίζω by *immergo*, but (what was not minded, or wilfully omitted) he adds alſo in the very next *abluo*: and after renders ἐβαπτίσθη (in *Luc.* 11. 38.) by *laviſſet*, had waſhed; and βαπτίσωνται, *Marc.* 7. 4. by *loti fuerint*, waſh. So then his bare ſaying of βαπτίζω, that it ſignifies *immergo* to dip, ſignifies nothing at all, unleſs he had ſpoken *excluſively*, as to all other ſignifications of the Verb: whereas he doth not that; but expreſly allows it the general ſignification of *waſhing*, according

cording to the then current expoſition of the Texts he cites for that ſignification of it. And ſo here's nothing to the purpoſe out of this Author neither.

§. 10. *Voſſius* ſuccedes him, and (as Mr. *D.* ſaith) tells us, 'that *it implieth a waſhing the whole Body.*

§. 11. 'Twas modeſtly ſaid by *Voſſius*, if he did ſay it, and will find no contradiction, provided his meaning be not, that it *always* ſignifie ſo, and never any thing other, or leſs. But where did *Voſſius* ſay ſo? Mr. *D.* doth not here tell us. But I ſuppoſe he means in his *Diſp.* 1. *de Baptiſmo, Theſ.* 1. *pag.* 343. For there he ſpeaks directly, and diſtinctly of the import of the word. And Mr. *D.* hath ſaid here nothing contrary unto what he there ſaith, only he tells us not all he ſaid. He ſaith, that βαπτίζειν properly notes *mergere* to dip, and that it is ſo explain'd in the old *gloſſaries*, firſt put forth by *H. Stephanus*, ſo as that it is more than ἐπιπολάζειν, to ſwim lightly at the top, and leſs than δύειν, which is to go to the bottom to ones own deſtruction.

§. 12. But firſt, if this be the proper import of the word in *Profane* Authors, unleſs it could be proved, that it were uſed in no other acception in the *Holy Writers*, the Argument makes nothing againſt the Church of *England*'s Hypotheſis: as I have elſewhere in theſe Papers made good.

§. 13. Secondly *Voſſius* ſaith (what Mr. *D.* was not pleaſed to take notice of) that becauſe a thing uſes commonly therefore to be dipped and wetted, that it may be waſhed, thence it is that, as the *Heb.* טבל (which the LXX. render βαπτίζω) is taken alſo for רחץ which is to waſh, ſo likewiſe among the *Greeks* is βαπτίζω by a *Metalepſis* uſed for the ſame, giving ſeveral inſtances thereof in *Jud.* 12. 7. *Sirac.* 34. 30. *Marc.* 7. 4. *Luk.* 11. 38. And that the baptiſms of *Pots*, and *Cups*, of *braſen Veſſels* and *Beds*, in *Marc.* 7. 4, 8. ought not otherwiſe to be underſtood.

§. 14. Thirdly, that, notwithſtanding what the word

in its proper acception did note out of the Church, *Vossius* thought sprinkling to suffice for a baptism in the Church, is evident by his express assertion hereof in his *Thes.* 9. *p.* 356. To which he adds as the reason, because in that there remains the *substance* of the Sacrament. And that in as much as in both there is an *ablution*, there may be seen a *Sacramental analogie* between the sprinkling of *water*, and that which is made with the *blood* of Christ. Now in fair dealing Mr. *D.* should as well have told us, what he said of the *thing*, as of the *word*; and of the grounds and way of his reconciliation of the one with the other: and then he had done ingenuously indeed. And if there had been no way of fair accommodation, then might this great Author, with all the weight of his reputation for deepness of Learning, and soundness of Judgment, have passed for as clear a witness for him, as he is now against him.

§. 15. *Mincæus* (as Mr. *D.* saith) in his Dictionary (tells us) 'That βάπτισμα à βαπτίζω is in the Latine *Bap-*'*tismus*, in the Dutch *Doopsel*, or *Doopen*, English *Baptism* 'or *Baptime*, *viz.* to *Dive*, or *Duck* in water, and the 'same with the *Hebrew* טבל to dip.

§. 16. I will not say, but that βαπτίζω doth signifie to *dive* or *duck* (if he will) in water (though I am not altogether satisfied with those words, when I remember they are words (especially the latter) whereby is expressed the manner of Ducks going into the Water, and consider what pleasances it would afford some Persons to see naked Men and Women go into the Water after that manner; and cannot call to mind, that ever any Men, or Women went, or were put, so, into the Water, when they were baptized, but after a way of more gravity and modesty) nor but that it is the same in sense with the *Heb.* טבל to dip: But then I must add, that its signifying *thus much*, doth not prove that it signifies *no more*; its signifying this doth not prove (what Mr. *D.* undertakes to prove, and for the proof whereof, as I suppose, he produces all these Testimonies) that the word we call *Baptism* is *nothing else*, but to dip, plunge

plunge (as they love alſo to ſpeak, though I am not over-well ſatisfied with that neither, it having never been the uſe of the Church to plunge Men, according to the propriety of that word, into Rivers or Fonts, when they were baptized, but for themſelves to go into them, or by others to be fairly put into them, if they were ſuch as could not go in of themſelves) or cover all over. In plain Engliſh, (as Mr. *D.* ſpeaks) it's like the *Heb.* טבל, ſignifies *that*, and *ſomething elſe*; to *dip* in particular, and to *waſh* in general, as the Learned in the Oriental Languages ſay, and hath been ſhewed in theſe Papers. Nor is this contradicted by *Mincæus.** And thus much for him.

'The next, that is brought in to charge us, is *Leigh* (as 'Mr. *D.* is pleaſed without any the leaſt title of reſpect to 'introduce that honourable Gentleman) and he (as Mr. 'D. tells us) in his *Critica Sacra*, ſaith, Its native and 'proper ſignification is to dip into water, or to *plunge* 'under water; for which he cites theſe Scriptures, where 'ſo uſed, viz. *Matth.* 3. 6. (it ſhould be 16.) *Act.* 8. 38. 'And that it is taken from a Dyer's Fat, and imports a '*Dying*, or giving a *freſh Colour*, and not a bare waſhing 'only, *Rev.* 19. 13. And for which he quotes *Caſaubon*, '*Bucan*, *Bullinger*, *Zanchy*, *Spanhemius*. He ſaith withal, 'That ſome would have it ſignifie *waſhing*, and which ſence '*Eraſmus*, he ſaith, oppoſed, affirming, that it was not 'otherwiſe ſo, than by conſequence, for the proper ſignification was ſuch a dipping or plunging, as Dyers uſe for 'Dying of Clothes.

§. 17. It is comfortable, that the *Author* is to be eaſily had, and the *place* conſulted. And for anſwer hereto little need be ſaid to him, that ſhall conſult the place. The firſt view, that ſhall be taken of it, will ſufficiently vindicate Mr. *Leigh*, and the truth. And becauſe it is material, and all Perſons, that ſhall be concerned in this debate, may not be in condition to conſult, or make the beſt advantage of that paſſage of that Author; therefore I will here by degrees give a total tranſcription of it.

§. 18. It is true, Mr. *Leigh* saith, That the native and proper signification of it is to *dip* into water, or to plunge under water, for which he cites *Matth.* 3. 16. *Act.* 8. 38. and also (what Mr. *D.* omits) *John* 3. 22, 23.

§. 19. But first I have made it appear in these Papers, that neither *Matth.* 3. 16. nor *Act.* 8. 38. prove that signification of the word. A *baptizing* they prove; but not a *dipping*.

§. 20. Secondly, though it be probable from *John* 3. 22. that the baptizing in *Ænon* was by dipping, yet that is not so much from the force of the word, as from that addition of the reason of *John*'s baptizing there, which was, because *there was much water there*. And yet, if a Man would dispute it stifly, even that reason will not demonstratively prove it. This it will prove, that it was a place of great conveniency for *John*'s purpose to baptize confluences of People in: (1.) Because there were ὕδατα πολλὰ, not *deep*, but *many* waters there. That may mean this, and nothing else but this, that there were there many several places of conveniency for baptizing, by reason of the windings in and out of the Brook, Mæander-wise, so that one company might be privately fitting and preparing themselves for baptism in one place, whilst *John* was administring it to another company in another place, or here a company of Men by themselves, and there a company of Women by themselves, as afterward in the Christian Church there were distinct apartments in the Baptisteries for the *Men*, and for the *Women*; and so the actions of stripping themselves, and going into, and coming out of the water naked, might be performed with more decency, and less observance; not with that disturbance to the company, not with that violence unto modesty, which must needs be, where the baptizing place was but one, and the multitudes to be baptized all together. And (2.) this is still the more probable, if we imagine any *Women* were baptized there also, as well as *Men*. And it is reasonable enough to imagine it, when it is said, *Matth.* 3. 5, 6. that

there

there went out to him Jeruſalem, and all Judea, and all the Region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him; and when it is remembred, that the *Women* alſo among the *Jews* were admitted unto Proſelytiſm *by Baptiſm*, as well as the Men. For great caution and reſpect unto the Feminine modeſty was had amongſt that *jealous* as well as *luſtful* People in the baptizing of their *Women*, that neither themſelves might be put to the bluſh, nor others have any laſcivious thoughts ſtirred up in them by any thing ſeen, or obſervable, in the baptizing of them. And if this be a probable account of the reaſon given for *John*'s baptizing in *Ænon*, becauſe of the *many waters there* (and I appeal even unto Mr. *D.* himſelf whether it be not) then can that reaſon conduce nothing to the proving, that the baptiſm performed there was by dipping. For not the *multitude* of waters, but the *deepneſs* and *wideneſs* of the water, had been proper to have been alledged in that caſe. And *John* might baptize many perſons, and companies of Perſons, in theſe many ſeveral, and not far diſtant waters, and yet dip none of them totally in any of them. And this is all it will prove.

§. 21. But thirdly, though it might be infallibly proved from theſe, or any other places, that the baptiſm, then and there, was by dipping, yet that can only prove, that βαπτίζω ſignifies to dip; and is ſometimes uſed in that ſenſe: (and we that are for *dipping* as well as for *ſprinkling*, are willing it ſhould ſignifie the one, as well as the other) but it cannot prove, that it ſignifies nothing more but to dip, and is never uſed in any other ſignification. And this indeed is the great miſtake, that becauſe βαπτίζω ſignifieth (and, if ye will, primarily and properly) to dip, therefore they will not grant, that it ſignifieth any thing elſe, eſpecially in the adminiſtration of Baptiſm. Whereas it hath a latitude in its import and uſe, as well as moſt words elſe have, and is granted ſo to have by Learned Authors, in that Sacrament, and particularly by Mr. *Leigh*, the Author quoted by Mr. *D.* againſt it, as we ſhall ſee inſtantly.

§. 22. For, ſo he begins, βαπτίζω, *Baptizo*, often. And then he goes on (whether as ſpeaking his own ſenſe, or Dr. *Featlyes*, or his own ſenſe in Dr. *Featlyes* words, whoſe name I ſee ſet in the end of the Period) The word *Baptize*, though it be derived from βάπτω, *tingo*, to dip, or plunge into the water, and ſignifieth primarily ſuch a kind of waſhing as is uſed in Bucks, where Linen is plunged and dipt: yet it is taken more largely for *any kind of waſhing*, rinſing, or cleanſing, *even where there is no dipping at all*, as *Matth.* 3. 11. and 20. 22. *Mark* 7. 4. and 10. 38. *Luk.* 3. 16. *Act.* 1. 5. and 11. 16. 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. This Mr. *D.* ſhould, methinks, have taken notice of, as well as of that which he tranſcribed, and reported this too to have been Mr. *Leigh*'s ſenſe of the word, as well as the other, if he had meant to do right to Mr. *Leigh*, and not be diſingenuous both to the truth and him. For whilſt unwary people hear only what Mr. *D.* ſaith from Mr. *Leigh*, and hear not alſo what Mr. *Leigh* ſaith of himſelf, they are apt to think, that what Mr. *D.* reports from him, is all that Mr. *Leigh* ſaid of the thing, and that he was of Mr. *Danvers*'s judgment, imbued with the ſame Sentiments with him, dipt into the ſame error that he is.

§. 23. But Mr. *Leigh* goes on, and from himſelf and others tells us, of ſix ſeveral acceptions of the word; the five firſt of which Mr. *D.* ſlips by, and reports only the Sixth and laſt, as if that were (as who, that ſaw no more reported from him, could think any other, but that it was?) Mr. *Leighs* only ſenſe of the word; with how much ingenuity I leave to himſelf and others to judge.

§ 24. It is put (ſaith Mr. *Leigh*) 1. *generally*, for waſhing, *Luk.* 11. 38. *Heb.* 9. 10. *Mark* 7. 4. βαπτίζωνται, they baptized themſelves. This he ſtrengthens by the Authority of Dr. *Featly* and *Voſſius*, as follows. Chriſt no where requireth *dipping*, but only *baptizing*: which word (as *Heſychius*, *Stephanus*, *Scapula*, and *Budæus*, the great Maſters of the Greek Tongue, make good by very many inſtances, and allegations out of Claſſic Writers)

ters) importeth no more than ablution or waſhing. Βαπτίζω (ſay they in their Lexicons and Commentaries) *lavo*: Βάπτισμα *lavatio, ablutio*, which may be done without dipping. Dr. *Featly* againſt the Anabaptiſts. Βαπτίζειν *propriè notat mergere: ſed quia ferè aliquid mergi ac tingi ſolet, ut lavetur atque abluatur, hinc pro lavare uſurpatur, Mark* 7. 4, 8. *Luk.* 11. 38. *A priore notione quæ mergere ſignificat, profluxit ea, quæ pro affligere uſurpatur: Quia qui affliguntur, calamitatum gurgite quaſi merguntur. Voſſius* in *Theſibus*. Then goes on Mr. *Leigh*, deſcanting as I ſuppoſe on *Mark* 7. 4. (the Text laſt named by himſelf, (the Two Teſtimonies from Dr. *Featly* and *Voſſius* coming in by way of *Parentheſis*) It implieth the waſhing of the whole body: There we read alſo of the waſhing of *cups, pots, veſſels, tables*. After this account of what it ſignifies *generally*, he goes on to ſhew that it is put 2. *Figuratively*, to plunge into great afflictions, *Matth.* 20. 22. *Mark* 10. 38. *Luk.* 12. 50. *Baptiſmus non ſignificat afflictionem quamlibet, ſed vehementem, & forinſecus irruentem, ut ſunt in Scripturis undæ perſecutionum & tribulationum, quibus qui merguntur & obruuntur, baptizari videantur. Eſtius ad* 1 *Cor.* 15. *v.* 29. 3. To *ſprinkle* or waſh ones body Sacramentally, *Matth.* 3. 11. (This Mr. *D.* ſhould in juſtice to the Author have taken notice of.) 4. It is taken for the whole work and action of the Sacrament of Baptiſm, as *Matth.* 28. 19. 5. To waſh the Conſcience *Spiritually*, *Matth.* 3. 11. *Act.* 1. 6. 6. The native and proper ſignification of it (which Mr. *D.* only takes notice of, overleaping all the reſt) is to dip into water, or to plunge under water. *Joh.* 3. 22, 23. *Matth.* 3. 16. *Act.* 8. 38. To all which places I have ſpoken in theſe Papers, ſhewing it not proved even from them.

§. 25. After this immediately Mr. *D.* adds, (as if ſpoken by Mr. *Leigh* of the word βαπτίζω, as all the reſt that went before is) And that it is taken from a *Dyers Fat*, and imports a Dying, or giving a freſh colour, and not a bare waſhing only, *Rev.* 19. 13. And for which

he quotes *Casaubon*, *Bucan*, *Bullinger*, *Zanchy*, *Spanhemius*. But (not to urge upon Mr. *D.* that thence it would follow, that in Baptism men ought to be *dyed*, and have a *fresh colour* given them, or else they are not baptized) Mr. *Leigh* saith not this of βαπτίζω, but of βάπτομαι, (which, by the way, are not words of exactly equal import, for why else is not βάπτομαι used in the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles for *baptizing*, as well as βαπτίζω?) which he renders *intingor* from *Rev.* 19. 13. which yet I have shewn to signifie nothing of dipping in that place, but to be meant only of *dying* or *staining*, and that without dipping. Nor doth he quote those Authors to prove this: but to prove what he had said of βαπτίζω, as to the last signification he had given it: to which he immediately subjoyns their Testimonies, however Mr. *D.* pulls them asunder from what they were set to prove, and chops in other matter betwixt. Their Testimonies, as Mr. *Leigh* quotes them, are. *Tanquam ad tingendum mergo.* Casaub. *Immergo, abluo.* Bucan. *Mergo & tingo.* Bullinger. *Propriè significat immergo, submergo, obruo aquâ.* Zanchius. *Videtur copiam, & abundantiam, perfectam quandam perfusionem denotare.* Aret. I wonder why Mr. *D.* did not Transcribe their Testimonies, unless it were because he saw among them *abluo*, and *tingo* as differing from *mergo*, which he was not willing his Reader should know. And why he left out *Aretius*, unless it was because he makes it to signifie *perfusionem* a pouring on of water, which he had no mind neither to have known. As for *Spanhemius* he saith nothing there. Only Mr. *Leigh* refers to him to see what he saith of these Verbs, βάπτω, βαπτίζω and βαπτίζομαι in his *Duh. Evang.* part. 3. Dub. 24. And it may be wondered also, why he skipt over what Mr. *Leigh* saith by the way of βάπτισμα and βαπτισμὸς: but that there was something fitter to be concealed. On the first word Mr. *Leigh* saith, βάπτισμα *baptisma* (1.) Dipping into water, (that would have done well; but the next that follows would not, and so it was left out) or *washing with* water, often.

1 *Pet.*

1 *Pet.* 3. 21. (2.) Miniſtery, and Doctrine of *John*, *Act.* 19. 3. *Mark* 1. *ver.* 4. On the ſecond Mr. *Leigh* ſaith βαπτισμὸς, *Baptiſmus*, *Mark* 7. 18. *Heb.* 6. 2. and 9. 10. Then he adds a quotation from *Zepperus de Sacramentis*; which Mr. *D.* could well have found in his heart doubtleſs to have added, (for he doth quote it afterward in another place, when he hath drawn it from its company, as if from his own reading, whereas I make no queſtion, but he had it here; and I ſhall anſwer it, when I come at it) but that there followed it immediately a quotation from *Danæus*, which he had no mind to, which is this. *Deducitur* ἀπὸ τῦ βάπτεσθαι *vel* βαπτίζεσθαι, *è quibus illud propriè* tingere *ſignificat*: *hoc autem* immergere, *maximè verò aquæ*: *Quia verò qui ex aquis emergunt*, *loti & candidi & mundi apparent*, *idcirco* βαπτισμὸς *pro lotione*, *& mundatione in Sacrâ Scripturâ ferè accipitur*. *Heb.* 9. *ver.* 10. *Luk.* 11. 38. *Mark* 7. 4. *Danæus Iſag. Chriſt. l.* 5. *de Sacramentis. c.* 21. He ſaw there βάπτεσθαι rendred *tingere*; and *tingere* contradiſtinguiſhed from *immergere*; that βαπτισμὸς was frequently in Scripture taken for *waſhing*, and *cleanſing*; and that, if I may gueſs, was the thing that ſcared him.

§. 26. But after all this Mr. *D.* hath a σοφὸν φάρμακον, a *ſalvo* to ſave himſelf whole from any thing that can be ſaid againſt him for his omiſſions; and to that I ſhall now attend him. He tells us, that he [*i. e.* Mr. *Leigh*] ſaith withal, that ſome would have it to ſignifie *waſhing* (he might have been ſo kind as to have told us who) and which ſenſe *Eraſmus* (he ſaith) oppoſed, affirming that it was not otherwiſe ſo, than by conſequence: for the proper ſignification was ſuch a *dipping* or plunging as *Dyers* uſe for *dying* of clothes.

§. 27. He ſhould have told us, that it was the ſenſe of Mr. *Leigh* himſelf, as well as of others. But then Mr. *Leigh*'s Teſtimony had been againſt him, as well as for him, and ſo had ſignified nothing to his advantage. For to grant it ſignifies *dipping*, and yet to ſay (as Mr. *Leigh* doth) that it ſigni-

signifies *sprinkling* too, spoils all, and will do the *Dippers* no service.

§. 28. And whereas he tells us, that Mr. *Leigh* saith, *Erasmus* opposed that sense, affirming that it was no otherwise so, than by consequence. I answer first, that if it be but any way so, whether directly, or by consequence, it is all one to our purpose, and will do our business as well. Let it but signifie *washing*, and that as distinct from *dipping*, and then whether it signifie so directly, or by consequence, baptizing will not necessarily import dipping. Secondly, I answer, that Mr. *Leigh* doth not say, that *Erasmus* opposed that Sense. But that which he saith is this, that whereas the *Vulg. Latin* rendred βαπτίζωνται in *Mark* 7. 4. by *baptizentur*, he tells us in his Margin from *Beza* on *Mark* 7. that *Erasmus* deservedly changed it: inasmuch as in that place the discourse is not of that solemn washing, whereunto (saith *Beza*) now by long usage of all Churches the term of Baptism hath been Dedicated and Consecrated. Nor indeed, saith *Beza*, (not *Erasmus*) doth βαπτίζειν signifie *lavare*, but by consequence: for properly it signifies to *dip* in order unto *dying*: which he proves by instances from *Plutarch* and *Nazianz.* as may be seen in his Notes, on *Mark* 7. *v.* 4. Nor does any body deny its signifying to *dip*, the granting of it being no way prejudicial to our Hypothesis, which proceeds not on what the word primarily and strictly noteth in its first imposition and use, but on what it is used, secondarily and more generally, to import in the Scriptures and Ecclesiastical Writers; and that as we have shewed in these Papers, is a washing in order unto the attaining of those Spiritual ends ordained by the Institutor of that Sacrament, however performed, whether by Dipping or by Sprinkling, by putting into water, or by pouring of water on the Party baptized. And the Reader of this Authors Writings may do well from hence to take warning, that he be not too hasty in giving credit to such a Writer's quotations, as in his reports from Authors takes a liberty to chop and change,

to

to put in or leave out, as may beſt ſerve, not the truth, but his own advantage.

§. 28. I cannot, before I paſs hence, but propoſe to the conſideration of Mr. *D.* or any elſe that inſiſt on that Notion of *Beza's*, that βαπτίζειν properly ſignifies *to dip in order unto dying*; whether any dipping that is done, not in order unto dying, be properly a Baptiſm, or no? If not, then, unleſs they dip, when they baptize, *in order unto dying*, theirs is no baptiſm, no more than ours: becauſe though theirs be a dipping, yet it is not a Dipping in order unto Dying. If it be, as they muſt ſay it is, becauſe it is impoſſible otherwiſe to juſtifie their own way to be a lawful baptizing; then I infer, either that Chriſtians are not bound to ſtand always, no not in Sacramental rites, to the proper and ſtrict ſignifications of words, and ſo we are free from blame, as to that, in what we practiſe, as well as they: or elſe they are guilty in what they practiſe, as well as we; in that they deviate in their practice from the Divine Inſtitution, not acting according to the proper import of the word in it. For though they ſtick cloſe to the Act, and dip, yet they deviate from the End of the Act, and *dip not for dying*. And it is the *End* that ſpecifies the Action.

§. 29. And again I propoſe, whether the inſiſting ſo ſtrictly on this Notion of the word do not tend to the ſtrengthning of the *Papiſts* in their notion of an *Indelible Character* introduced by Baptiſm on the Soul. For if baptizing be, according to the proper ſignification of the word, a *dipping in order unto dying*; and there is no Dye brought by the baptiſmal water on the body; it remains that by baptizing there be a Dye brought upon the Soul, and that is, or may be the Character they contend for. If this be not to be granted, then is not that Notion fit to be received, or inſiſted on, but to be caſhiered. The next Author that calls for our attendance is *Salmatius*. And he in his Book *de Prim. Papæ*, p. 193. ſaith (as Mr. *D.* tells us) '*That is* 'not *Baptiſm they give to Children, but Rhantiſm.*

§. 30. I hope Mr. *D.* reports the Author right; not having

having him by me to examine. And if it be true, that he so say, (which the Reader may do well to demur upon, till he have the opportunity to see it in the Author) then I answer to him, that the word Baptism may be considered either more *strictly*, as signifying in particular, immersion or dipping, as it is mostly used in *Profane Authors*; or more *largely*, as signifying in general, *any washing*, and, as it is used in *Christian Writers*, to denote that Sacramental washing, whereby we are initiated into the Church, however performed, whether by putting into water, or by pouring water upon. If we take Baptism in the first and strict sense, then it is not Baptism they give to Children: for sprinkling is not dipping. But if we take it in the second, then it is: for to sprinkle with the due form of words is to baptize. And so this Testimony is either impertinent, or untrue. Let Mr. *D.* chuse which he will have it to be.

§. 31. 'After him follows *Casaubon*, and He in his An-'notations upon *Matth.* 3. annexed to the New Testament 'set forth by *Stephens*, (as Mr. *D.* tells us) saith, That 'immerging was the Proper Right in Baptism, which the 'word it self (he saith) sufficiently declares, which as it 'signifies not δύνειν, a going down to the bottom, without 'any ascending; so not ἐπιπολάζειν, a swimming like a Cork 'above the water, but βαπτίζειν, a going down, and coming 'up again.

§. 32. Mr. *Casaubon* doth indeed say, This was a baptizing Rite (or Ceremony in Baptism) that they were dipped into the waters. But he doth not say, either that immersion was total of the whole Person, which is the thing in question; or that, if it were so, it was the proper rite of baptism, as if there were no other rite but that. That word [*proper*] wherein the whole stress of the Testimony lies, is an Addition to his words. And at this rate what may not any Man make any Man say? Yea but that was his meaning, for the word it self

Hic enim fuit baptizandi ritus, ut in aquas immergerentur.

ſelf βαπτίζειν ſufficiently declares it, which as it ſignifies not δύνειν, a going down to the bottom without aſcending; ſo not ἐπιπολάζειν, a ſwimming like a Cork above the water, as Mr. *D.* reports him. But Mr. *Caſaub.* doth not ſo explain δύνειν. He only ſaith it means to go to the bottom to ones hurt or deſtruction, if ye will. But one may go down to the bottom, and come up again without either his deſtruction or hurt any way. And ſo many have done in their baptizing. And what ever δύνω in its primitive uſe imports, it is not in the Eccleſiaſtical uſe of it excluſive of what βαπτίζω ſignifies, elſe thoſe that went down to the bottom, muſt not be ſaid to be βαπτιζόμενοι, but δυνόμενοι; and then many ſuppoſed anciently to have been baptized, will prove not to have been ſo. For, contrary to what he ſaith, both καταδύεσθαι which ſignifies to go down to the bottom, is by St. *Athanaſius* * uſed of baptizing; and καταδύσεις is by St. *Baſil* uſed to expreſs the act of baptizing; unleſs δύνω do not ſignifie the ſame with the verbs compounded of it. And then, if they ſignifie to go down to the bottom, it muſt not ſignifie ſo much (which yet it doth, if *fundum petere* do ſo ſignifie.) And then if βαπτίζω be neither to ſwim at the top, nor to go down to the bottom, What will it ſignifie other than δύνω; which yet is quite contrary to Mr. *Caſaubon*, who ſaith, *non ſignificat* δύνειν, that it ſignifies not that.

Eſt fundum petere cum ſua pernicie.

* Τὸ γὰρ καταδῦσαι τὸ παιδίον ἐν κολυμβήθρᾳ τεῖναν καὶ ἀναδῦσαι — *Athanaſ. q.* 94. *de Interp. Parab. Script.* Ἐν τεισὶν οὖν καταδύσεσι καὶ ἰσαρίθμοις ἐπικλήσεσι τὸ μέγα μυστήριον τῆς βαπτίσματος τελεῖται. *Baſil. de S. Sp. c.* 15.

§. 33. As for ἐπιπολάζειν, Mr. *Caſaubon* explains it not. But Mr. *D.* doth, calling it a ſwimming like a Cork above the water. And truly I think the manner of baptizing was never ſuch, as that Children, or others, ſwam in the waters on that faſhion, *like Corks*, whileſt they were baptizing. But as for ſome other words, by which *Scapula* explains

explains ἐπιπολάζω, viz. *in superficie sum, exto, existo*, to be on, or appear out of the surface or top, I think that which they signifie reconcileable with some ways of baptizing, and theirs particularly, whose baptizing is but a partial mersation, a dipping of their heads or faces into the water.

§. 34. But supposing βαπτίζειν to signifie neither δύνειν, nor ἐπιπολάζειν, as Mr. *Casaubon* saith, What signifies it then? Mr. *D.* tells you (not Mr. *Casaubon*) that it signifies βαπτίζειν. Good. It puts me in mind of the story of the old Country-man, who being to explain, what was meant by an *inundation*, very gravely did it thus, An inundation is, as if a Man should say, an inundation. So here βαπτίζειν is not δύνειν, nor ἐπιπολάζειν, but βαπτίζειν.

§. 35. But however we are told, what βαπτίζειν signifies, a going down, and coming up again. Going or putting down may be in the import of it, but coming up again is not. Unless to go down be the same thing with coming up, or coming up the same thing with going down. And the Fathers have other words for that part of the Ceremony, *viz.* ἀναδύειν, and ἀναδύσαι, as appears from St. *Athanasius* in the place before mentioned; as also from St. *Chrysostome. Hom.* 40. on 1 *Corinth.*

Τὸ δὲ βαπτίζεσθαι καὶ καταδύεσθαι, εἶτα ἀναδύειν, &c. *D.* Chrys.

§. 36. But after all this, was Mr. *Casaubon* an *Anabaptist*? or did he in his judgment think a total immersion necessary unto Baptism, so as that nothing less than that was a baptizing? but all a meer nullity? No such matter. He tells you indeed, that some, who long before had disputed for that Ceremony, had somewhat whereon they grounded their dispute: for they urged the word βαπτίζειν. But, saith he, *these Mens opinion hath long since been deservedly exploded:* in as much as *the force and energie of this mystery doth not lye in that.* So then with him baptism is good, though not by a total immersion. And it is plain he was satisfied on other accounts, in the lawfulness of sprinkling, what-

whatever he thought βαπτίζω might signifie. And this should have been told us with the rest upon fair play.

§. 37. *Pindarus* (to go on with his *Authors*) in his *Ode* 2. 'calls a *Cork* swimming upon the face of the waters unbapti-'zed; and *Plutarch* a ship floating on the water unbaptized.

§. 38. This looks like an Argument indeed, and is in a manner the only one that I have met withal, that hath the look of one. And if we were of necessity bound up by the Heathenish signification of the word, and had no way of relaxation from it, it would be of some moment. But both the force of it is taken off in general; and it is at large answered to in particular, in these Papers. *ch.* 8. *& ch.* 5. *Sect.* 18. *&c.*

§. 39. *Beza* (to proceeed) saith (as Mr. *D.* tells us) '*that the word* βαπτίζειν *signifies* to *Dye by dipping or wash-*'*ing*, and differs from the word δύναι signifying to drown, 'or go down to the bottom as a stone.

§. 40. Supposing Mr. *D.* to have rightly quoted him, and that *Beza* did say so, hence it will follow, that in strict speaking according to the propriety of the word, none now are baptized, even amongst the Dippers themselves, (1.) Because none of those whom they dip, are *dyed* by their dipping; the deepest water they dip them in, gives them a *wash*, if ye will, but not a *dye*. If it do, 'twere well we knew it, that we might know them, as well as they one another by it. (2.) Because, in regard they baptize no Infants, (whose way of baptizing, when dipped, as anciently most were, was to be put so under the water, as neither to swim at the top, nor go down like a stone to the bottom, but to be for the time they stayed in the water, betwixt both) but baptize all Adult persons, all the persons, whom they baptize, go down to the bottom, though indeed not hurl'd into the River, and sinking to the bottom like Stones, yet going into it of themselves on their feet, and having their heads and upper parts of their bodies put down further towards the bottom by their Dipper. Now methinks they should not press upon us, strictness of significations

fications of words, whose own practice is lyable to be pressed, even by us, with strictness of significations of words, of their own giving, or owning.

§. 41. But having consulted the place here referred to by Mr. *D.* I do not find one such word in it. So that unless he quoted from an Edition differing from mine, instead of being a *Quoter*, Mr. *D.* is become the *Author* of those words.

§. 42. But suppose there had, what is the advantage to his cause by it, when the truth by us contended for is granted, even by the Testimony produced by him against it? For if βαπτίζειν do signifie *to dye by dipping, or washing*, then, unless dipping and washing be exactly Synonymous, and signifie just the same thing, which not Mr. *D.* himself will say, if there be a Dying by *washing*, though not by dipping, yet that will be a Baptism by this Testimony, which tells us, that βαπτίζειν signifies to Dye by *washing*, as well as by *dipping*; which is the thing in question.

§. 43. Yet there is something said by *Beza* on that Text, which may seem to favour Mr. *Danvers*. And 'tis a wonder, that he, that can find an advantage, where there is none, would overlook one, where it seems to be. For *Beza* saith, *Baptizandi verbum*, the word to Baptize, rather answers to the Hebrew טבל, than רחץ. But if it do, still that will not do the business, for I have shewn in these Papers (*ch.* 7.) from Dr. *Pocock*, that that word also is not always necessarily to be understood of a total immersion. And *Beza* himself doth not contradict this, For he doth not say, that it answers absolutely and strictly to this, and not at all to the other, but *rather* to this than to the other word. Which in *English* is thus much, that it answers to *both*, but yet is seldomer used in the sense of the latter, than of the former; which I believe to be the very truth. But it is not the least tittle of advantage that Mr. *D.* gains to his cause thereby, if granted him with the greatest liberality of Concession, as I have elsewhere shewed.

§. 44. And

§. 44. And there is ſomething alſo on that Text, which it need not be wondred if Mr. *D.* did overlook. This it is, that the Prepoſition ἐν was added to ὕδατι, by an Idiotiſm of the *Hebrews*, amongſt whom ב declares every ſort of cauſe, and is omitted by *Luke*, who followed not the Hebrew Dialect ſo much as the other three Evangeliſts. His meaning was, that ἐν here was a redundant, needleſly added to the caſe of the Inſtrument, as is apparent from what he ſaith after, of the ſame Particle when joyned to πνεύματι in the latter end of the verſe. And he tells you, that he notes this, leſt any ſhould think there was any force in this Particle, which they ſeem to be perſwaded of, who do not think children rightly baptized, unleſs they be totally dipped. And in his Note on *Mark* 1. 8. where the ſame Prepoſition comes again with the ſame words, he ſaith, 'of the Pleonaſm (*i. e.* redundancy) of 'the Prepoſition ἐν I have ſpoke elſewhere, which truly 'is to be noted in this place, leſt any altogether unskilful 'perſon ſhould take *in aqua* for *intra aquam*: of which 'kind of fopperies the books of Sophiſters are full.

§. 45. And though *Beza* do elſewhere declare that βαπτίζειν doth properly ſignifie *tingendi cauſâ immergere*, to dip in order unto dying, and that it ſignifies not to waſh, but by *conſequence*: yet (1.) he doth not always render it by *immergo*, but ſometime by *lavo*; and particularly in *Mark* 7. 4. where for βαπτίζωνται he hath *loti fuerint*, and for βαπτισμὸς *lotiones*: and on *Luke* 11. 38. he ſaith that βαπτίζειν means the ſame in that place, that νίπτεσθαι and χερνίπτειν do, *i. e.* in general to *waſh*, and particularly to *waſh the hands*: of which I have ſpoke before, *ch.* 5. And (2.) in his Ep. 2. (*Tract. Theolog. Vol.* 3. *p.* 195.) he maintains them to be rightly baptized, who are baptized but by *ſprinkling*, though the word do ſignifie *dipping*; no diminution being made of baptiſm by the change of a circumſtance in it, whilſt what is ſubſtantial in it is reteined, as I ſhall ſhew more at large in theſe Papers, *c. pennlt.* But to go on,

§ 46. *Selden*

§. 46. *Selden* (that University of Scholars in one man, and a Gentleman not to be mentioned without some signification of respect, though here he have none given him) *De Jure Nat. &c. l. 2. c. 2.* (as Mr. *D.* tells us) saith, 'That the *Jews* (from whom this Rite is conceived to 'come) took the Baptism wherein the whole Body was 'not baptized, to be void.

§. 47. I believe Mr. *D.* to be fair in this report, though I have not the Author to consult. But I Answer, First, that Christians are not so scrupulous about the business as the Jews were. Nor do I believe, Mr. *Danvers* himself, or any of his party, would think a baptism void, in case one hair of a head should chance to miss dipping, as a Jew would. Some few may have anciently questioned the lawfulness of the baptism, that is not administred by a total immersion (though I remember but one, that did it:) and of late some more have done it. But the generality of Christians both are, and have been anciently satisfied with it, though done other ways. And in some circumstantial point, a thing may fail of being exactly according to the accurate prescription of the Law, or Rule of Custom, and yet not be invalid for all that, whilst nothing of substance is omitted, as for instance, a Marriage without a Ring; or a Baptism without a Cross. Though it should not have been done so, yet being so done it will stand good. *Fieri non debuit, factum valuit.* Yea Mr. *Selden* quotes a saying from the Rabbies,---*Ideo nec Sabbato Baptismus rite satis adhibebatur, nec die festo, nec noctu. Quibus temporibus nihilominus si forte adhiberetur, Proselytus quidem is erat qui sic baptizatus. Actus scilicet* (saith Mr. *Selden*) *non irritus erat, tametsi fieri non debuisset.* Seld. *de Jure Nat. & Gent. l. 2. c. 2. p.* 143.

§. 48. Secondly, I answer, that unless Christians had been indispensably obliged by some Precept, to an exact conformity herein with the Jews, their practice is no Tye on us. But as the *Dippers*, I think, are unable to prove the one, so I hope I have satisfactorily in these Papers proved the other, *v. ch.* 8.

Sect. 49. Mr.

§. 49. Mr. *Daniel Rogers* (to pass on to him) in his Treatise of Sacraments, *Part.* 1. *c.* 8. *p.* 177. (it should be *ch.* 5. *p.* 69. and 70.) saith, as Mr. *D.* reports him, 'That 'the Minister is to dip in water, as the meetest Act; the 'word βαπτίζω notes it, for the Greeks wanted not other 'words to express any other Act besides Dipping, if the 'Institution could bear it. What resemblance of the 'Burial or Resurrection of Christ is in Sprinkling? All 'Antiquity and Scripture, saith he, confirm that way. To 'dip therefore is exceeding material to the Ordinance; 'which was the usage of old, without exception of Coun-'tries hot or cold.

§. 50. A very smart, and pressing Testimony this; if all be as Mr. *D.* reports it. But here to see the luck of it, (good or bad, let Mr. *D.* look to that) he hath not given us Mr. *Rogers*'s words in full, nor in the order he spake them, but hath pickt out here and there, what he thought good, leaving the rest. A way of proceeding, this, by which a man may be made to say what one will. But I will not go about to charge him with wronging Mr. *Rogers* in the whole of his sense, who speaks much to the same purpose, though not exactly in those words. And yet I cannot find in Mr. *Rogers* the very first, and those very material words, [*That the Minister is to dip in water as the meetest Act.*] Nor those words [*the word* βαπτίζω *notes it.*] But something there is, that is near it, if Mr. *D.* would have spoke it out. (And it is pity he should either muzzle his Author, or ham-string his own Pen.) But then it would not have been for his purpose. For he says, the word *baptized* signifieth the true Act of the Minister to dip or dop the body, or *some part of it* into the water. This one word [or *some part of it*] hath quite spoil'd all Mr. *Rogers* Testimony, as to the doing of the Dippers any service in their cause. For nothing will serve their turn to be done in baptism, or signified by the word baptize, but a total dipping of the whole body, and Mr. *Rogers* Testimony reaches but a dipping of the body, *or some part of it* into the water.

§. 51. And that this was not an expression, that fell casually from him, but was his very judgment, appears by what he said before, That it ought to be the Churches part to cleave to the Institution, especially it being not left arbitrary by our Church to the discretion of the Minister, but required (as it then was) to dip or dive the Infant *more* or *less*, except in case of weakness. A dipping, total or partial, the Man would have: but so there was but either, the Institution was cleaved to, and the Churches order observed, so far as I can perceive, in his judgment.

§. 52. And that, as warm as Mr. *Rogers* was for retriving the use of Dipping, as witnessed to by *Antiquity*, approved by *Scripture*, required by the *Church* (as then it was, with not so much appearance of liberty in the case granted to the Minister, as now is) and *Symbolical* with the things signified in Baptism, which I could wish as well as, and as heartily as he, in order to the making of peace in the Church, if that would do it, I say, that he was only so for dipping, as yet not to hold any unlawfulness to be in sprinkling, there is sufficient evidence, because he thinks, that for the allowance of that, in case of weakness, we have cause to be thankful. And I presume his zeal was only against those, that stretcht the liberty of the Church in this case deeper and further, than either the Church her self could, or the solemness of this Sacrament might well and safely admit, as himself speaks. And as in the beginning of this Section he saith, *I would not be understood, as if Schismatically I would instill a distast of the Church into any weak minds by the act of sprinkling water only:* so in the end of it he saith again, *I do not speak this as a thing meet to disturb a Churches peace, but as desiring such as it concerns, in their places to look to their liberty and duty in this behalf.*

§. 53. And I shall conclude with a wish, that the *Quoter* of him would have but the same thoughts of it, as his *Author* had, and there would soon be an agreement with him

him and the Church, which *requires dipping*, but *allows ſprinkling*, on juſt reaſon for it. And if he had any Children to be baptized, he might have them dipped, and totally too in it, if he deſired it. And I muſt needs ſay, that if there be any failure in this caſe, and perhaps there may be ſome, it is not in the *Church*, nor in her Orders; for by them *dipping is preſcribed*, unleſs where an inability well to endure it in the Infant is certified; but in the *Actors*, and if any way at all in the Baptizer, yet moſtly, if not ſolely, in the *Bringers* of the Infants unto Baptiſm; which every Man may have, as to his own concern, amended and reformed at his pleaſure. Nay, if I may ſpeak my thoughts, I believe the Miniſters of the Nation would be heartily glad, if the People would deſire, or be but willing to have their Infants dipped, after the ancient manner both in this and in other Churches, and bring them to Baptiſm in ſuch a condition, as that they might be totally dipped, without fear of being deſtroyed.

§. 54. 'Dr. *Taylor* (ſo Mr. *D.* goes on) in his Rule of 'Conſcience, *l.* 3. *c.* 4. If you would attend to the pro-'per ſignification of the word, Baptiſm ſignifies plunging 'in water, or dipping with waſhing.

§. 55. I am not willing to ſay it, yet am apt to ſuſpect it, that Mr. *D.* is the Author of thoſe words, and not Dr. *Taylor*. My reaſon is, becauſe he gives us no particular direction to the place where they may be found. He quotes indeed, *l.* 3. *c.* 4. but he names not the Section, Rule, Number, nor Page. And he had need have more time and leiſure than I, that ſhall make it his buſineſs to read over a *Chapter of an hundred and ten pages in Folio*, to find whether he ſpeak true or no. He names afterward, when he had a mind to be found, *l.* 3. *c.* 4. *p.* 644, 645. Why not here? I have ſhewed my ſuſpicion, and my reaſon to ſuſpect. And I am ſtrengthened therein by this, that (as I ſhall ſhew afterwards) he quotes a ſaying of *Muſculus*, on *Matth.* 3. at large, without naming verſe of the Chapter, or Page of the Book, and, as upon diligent ſearch I

have found, there are no such words said by *Musculus* on that Chapter. And though I have not read all this Chapter, yet I have read all the places in it, which speak of Baptism, as far as I can find direction thereto by the *Index*. And no such words appear to me therein. Nay, a Friend of mine, that hath twice perused the whole Chapter, upon the meer design of finding that passage in it, assures me that it is not there. And if it were, the answer thereto is very easie, that though what he names were the proper signification of the word, it doth not follow, that it must be taken in no other but that proper signification in Baptism; in regard words are not in all places, and upon all occasions, used in no other but that which is their proper signification; but sometimes in acceptions very different, and remote from the first; as he that is but a little acquainted with Rhetorick can tell. And this word in particular hath in the Ecclesiastical use of it (by a *Metalepsis*, or a *Synecdoche* of the *Species* for the *Species*) been of ancient time, even up to the beginning, for ought that any Man can prove to the contrary, used to signifie that Sacramental washing, which we call baptism, though not performed by that specifical way of dipping, but by any other way of washing, whether it be persusion, affusion, or aspersion.

§. 56. Mr. *Joseph Mede* is the next witness produced by Mr. *Danvers*. And he in his *Diatribe*, on *Tit.* 3. 2. saith, '*That there was no such thing as sprinkling or Rhantism used* '*in Baptism in the Apostles days, nor many Ages after* '*them.*

§. 57. To this I answer, (1.) If Mr. *Mede* had said, he knew of no such thing, or had read of no such thing, it had been an expression suitable to his modesty. But positively to say, *There was no such thing*, seems a stretch somewhat too far beyond what ought to have been said. It is easie to say of a thing, that it *was done* in the Apostles days, when there appears just evidence for it. But who can say what was *not done* in the Days of the Apostles? Unless

leſs he had read (what yet I am apt to think Mr. *Mede* himſelf, as great a Searcher into Antiquities as he was, would not have pretended to have read, *viz.*) all that has been writ of what was done in the Apoſtles days: and withall unleſs all that was done in their days had been written too, which no Man with any the leaſt appearance of reaſon can pretend to ſay. But great Men ſometimes take a pleaſure to ſay great things, and think that their greatneſs carries authority enough with it to bear them out in all they ſay. But it will not, beyond reaſon, when what they ſay comes to be examined by reaſon. And ſo this great Man's word here is of no more weight, than a great Man's word can be without its ground, whereof here he gives us none.

§. 58. And on the contrary to what he ſaith, I have in *Ch.* 10. ſhewn fair probabilities even of a ſprinkling or Rhantiſm uſed in Baptiſm even in the Apoſtles days. Unto which I may now here add, that if there be any ſoundneſs in their expoſition of that difficult Text [1 Cor. 15. 29. *What ſhall they do that are baptized for the dead?*] who expound there ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν, not for, but *over* the dead; grounding their expoſition on a Cuſtom in the Ancient Church to baptize the living over the Graves of the dead, this *gives* a further probability unto it; it being nothing ſo likely that in ſuch places they were dipped (there being neither Rivers nor Fonts there) as that they were ſprinkled. And that we find it in moſt Ages after the Apoſtles, and can find no Original of it in any Age after theirs, this is probability enough of its being in uſe even in their Age.

Unde etiam ſuper Sepulchris baptizabantur in veteri Eccleſia, qui ſuper mortuis baptizari dicuntur. 1 Cor. 15. 29. Voſſ. de Sacrament. efficacii, diſp. 1. Theſ. 29. p. 302.

§. 59. Secondly, whereas Mr. *Mede* ſaith, it was not uſed many Ages after the Apoſtles days (unleſs he mean, that it was not uſed ſolemnly and in publick, but only in private, and upon caſes of neceſſity, in which, if he ſay it, he doth not contradict us) I am not able to ſay, it is true,

having by sufficient instances already in these Papers demonstrated the contrary. And if what Mr. *Danvers* saith (*p.* 204.) be true, that *until the Third Century we find not any, that upon any consideration, did admit of Sprinkling*, yet if any in that Age did admit it, then there was such a thing as Sprinkling or Rhantism used in Baptism (quite contrary to what Mr. *Mede* saith, and that even by the confession of Mr. *D.*) not many Ages after the Apostles. Unless any will say, that the Third Century was many Ages after the First, which yet I think none that understands Number and Multitude will say. And that some body in that Age did admit of it Mr. *D.* is our witness, who quotes *Cyprian* for it in his Epistle to *Magnus l.* 4. *ep.* 7. Where he pleads for the baptizing of the sick by Sprinkling, and not by dipping or pouring, called the *Clinical Baptism. Magd. Cent.* 3. *c.* 6. *p.* 126. As also for the *Sprinkling of new converted Prisoners in the Prison house. And which by degrees afterwards they brought in use for sick Children also, and then afterwards all children.* So that by this Testimony little is gained to the cause more than what the credit of the bare name of Mr. *Mede* can give to it. But *amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, magis tamen amica veritas.*

§. 60. But what, after all this, if Mr. *Mede* in saying, *no such thing was used*, did not mean, that *no such thing was done*, but that it was not done so oft, as that the doing of it might be called an *use*; as if he had said, no such thing was come up, or grown into use, or to be an use? Then is his saying clearly reconcileable with what we say. For we contend but for the doing of it *on some occasions*; not for its being the *use* so to do. And methinks his saying that no such thing was *used* many Ages after the Apostles, must needs enforce that to be his meaning. For Mr. *Mede* was too knowing a Person in Antiquity, to be ignorant of it, that such a thing as Sprinkling or Rhantism was done within few Ages after the Apostles (and particularly St. *Cyprians* Epistle to *Magnus* must needs tell him it was done in the *Third*) though he knew it was not come so soon to be

the

the uſe. And if that be his meaning, then are his words nothing at all to the purpoſe of Mr. *D.* as ſpeaking but the ſame that we ſay. If not, I ſhall add no more, but that *Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*, it was a ſlip of his unwary Pen, whilſt his thoughts were more intent upon other matter.

§. 61. *Chamier* ſucceeds Mr. *Mede* (one great man after another) and from his *Pan. Cathol. Tom.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 2. *Ser.* 6. Mr. *D.* quotes this. '*The ancient uſe of Baptiſm* '*was to dip the whole Body into the Element, which is the* '*force τῦ βαπτίζειν: therefore did* John *Baptize in a River,* '*which is, nevertheleſs changed into aſperſion, though un-* '*certain when, and from whence that Cuſtom was taken.*

§. 62. To this I Anſwer Firſt, that if *Chamier* did ſay, that the Ancient uſe of Baptiſm was to dip the whole body into the Element, then his meaning only was, that it was anciently the more *general* or more *conſtant*, or *publick* and *ſolemn*, but not the *only* manner, ſo to baptize. But this hurts not our cauſe, who do not contend that Sprinkling was the only, or the more general, or the more publick, and ſolemn way of baptizing in the ancient Church, but only that it was *ſometimes*, and moſtly in *private*, and in caſes of great *neceſſity*, *charity*, or *conveniency*, made uſe of in it. And as this hath been, I hope ſufficiently, manifeſted in theſe Papers, ſo the words of *Chamier*, even as Mr. *D.* reports them, do not contradict it: they only affirming what anciently was in uſe, but not denying any thing elſe to have been then done. Suppoſe it ſhould be ſaid, that the Modern uſe of Baptiſm in this Kingdom for this laſt Century has been to ſprinkle water on the face of the baptized. Would this conclude that none in this Kingdom have been otherwiſe baptized in this laſt Century than by ſuch Sprinkling? I ſuppoſe not. Nor do I believe the thing true, if it ſhould be aſſerted. No more doth the affirming of the ancient uſe to have been dipping, conclude that there was none then any other way baptized than by dipping. As ſome therefore in the late times of the prevalency of

Sprinkling,

Sprinkling have been dipped, so no doubt some in the ancient times of the prevalency of dipping were sprinkled.

In usu verò Elementi ab initio immersio totius corporis adhibita fuit. Chamier, Contract. l. 5. c. 1. p. 1404. parag. 4.

§. 63. But secondly, *Chamier* doth not say so, if *Spanhemius* his Contracter report him truly. His words are, That in the use of the Element at the beginning immersion of the whole body was practised. These words do only imply that at the first beginning to baptize, dipping of the whole body was in use, which we grant. But they do not imply that no other way of baptizing besides dipping was then also used. Though that then were, yet there might be other ways also besides that, for ought here said by *Chamier*. And admitting that to have been the only way of baptizing at the very beginning of the use of that Sacrament, suppose in our Saviour's life, or just immediately after his death: yet if other ways of baptizing came into use presently, or a little after, suppose in the time of the Apostles, then will those ways of baptizing be good enough: though dipping have a little the start of them, and be in priority of time somewhat before them. But this *Chamier* doth not contradict, only telling us what was at the beginning, but not denying what might presently after follow.

Quæ vis est τὸ βαπτίζειν, Chamier. *ib.*

§. 64. As for his saying, *that the force of* βαπτίζω *is to dip the whole body into the Element*: I answer, if his meaning be, that the Verb βαπτίζω hath that force, we freely grant it. But that hurts not us. But if his meaning be, that βαπτίζω hath no other force but that, and that it is never used in any either profane or sacred Writer but in *this only* signification, then we as freely deny it. And I suppose the contrary thereunto hath in these Papers been already made sufficiently manifest.

§. 65. As for what Mr. *D.* adds, as said by *Chamier*, *viz.* that *therefore* John *did baptize in a River*; this, if *Chamier* did say it, is capable of a double meaning: either

ther that *John* did baptize in a River, because that was the force of βαπτίζω; or else that βαπτίζω hath that force, because *John* baptized in a River.

§. 66. If the first be meant, it is said without proof; nor can be credible, unless we could be assured of two things. (1.) That βαπτίζω signifies always exactly so, and never otherwise. (2.) That the Commission, by vertue of which *John* did baptize, was given in Greek; and that βαπτίζω was the particular word in that Commission. But these two things will never be attempted to be shown, unless I take my measures much amiss.

§. 67. If the Second be meant, and the force of βαπτίζω be concluded to be, to dip the whole body in the Element, because *John* did baptize in a River, I answer, first, it is ridiculous to think, that the word βαπτίζω should take its signification from any action of *John*'s, which was a word in possession of its being and signification long before *John*'s either Baptism, or Birth. Secondly, the vanity of concluding, that Baptism ought to be by dipping the whole body, because *John* baptized in a River, if that be it that is meant, and was designed by the *Author*, or *Reporter* (as I am apt to believe it was, and only by the *Later*) the vanity, I say, and unconcludingness (if I may so speak) of that Argument hath already so oft been detected in these Papers, that I shall not vex the Reader with a tedious repetition thereof. In short therefore it signifies nothing unless it were impossible for a man to go into a River, and be baptized therein, by sprinkling or pouring water on him, or dipping some part of him, as namely his face, or head into it, without his whole body be immersed into it also: which no man of reason, or even of common sense, will adventure to say.

§. 68. But I am apt to think that *Chamier* did not say any such thing: partly because it is too inconsequent and ridiculous to be affixed on a man so judicious, and learned; and partly because there is no such word reported from him by his Contracter *Spanhemius*. And then it must remain

main that it be an Addition made to *Chamier* by Mr. *Danvers*.

§. 69. As for those words reported by Mr. *D.* as *Chamiers* [*Which is nevertheless changed into aspersion, though uncertain when, and from whence that custom was taken*] they are not exactly the words of *Chamier*, but these (as his Contracter reports them [*postea mutata fuit in aspersionem, incertum quando, aut quo initio*] it was afterwards changed into aspersion, though it be uncertain when, or at what beginning. *It is* and *it was*, are different words, and speak of differing times; the first, of the Present, the second of the Past: The first makes the alteration seem to be Modern, the second entitles it to Antiquity. And we must not be wrenched from any thing of our right by any mans never so subtle Sophistry. It was changed, says *Chamier*, and so say we, though neither he nor we know when, nor what it was that gave the occasion to its change. And Mr. *D.* had done himself and his Cause more right, if he had made a Right report from his Author.

—*Nisi quod videntur* 3000. *uno die à paucis Apostolis, non potuisse baptizari si singuli mersi fuissent; nec carcerario intra carcerem fuisse ad manum tantum aquæ quantum mergendo opus erat.* Cham. *ib.*

§. 70. But is this all that *Chamier* saith? surely no. We find a *nisi* in the case; and even no less than a *double* exception to what went before; the first is of the baptizing of three thousand in one day, by a few Apostles, which saith he, seems impossible to have been done by the immersion of every single person. The other is of the Gaoler baptized in the prison, who seems not to have had there so much water at hand as was needful for a baptism by dipping. So here, at one of these times, to *Chamier* it seems *aspersion* might begin (and if at either, it was early enough begun, and by Authority good enough done, to justifie its practice) and but for these instances the beginning of it would be uncertain. But if neither of those was the beginning time of Sprinkling, yet his very confessing the uncer-

uncertainty of it, *when and from whence was taken that cuſtom of Aſperſion*, into which the way of total immerſion was afterwards changed, is a plain confeſſion of the very great Antiquity, and even Primitiveneſs of that cuſtom: thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Uſages being Rationally to be preſumed ſuch, whoſe practice is derived to us from ancient times by the Catholick Church, but of whoſe Original in after times, that are ſhort of the Primitive, no account can be given.

§. 71. Nor yet hath *Chamier* done, but adds (what Mr. *D.* could not but be unwilling his people ſhould have reported to them from a Proteſtant Author ſo learned and judicious as *Chamier*) that certainly the uſe of Sprinkling is the more commodious, both in regard of the diſcommodities of Seaſons, and in reſpect of Modeſty, on account whereof *Deaconneſſes* were in time paſt made uſe of for the ſtripping of women naked. Whence in the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* it is ſaid to be their office to wait on the Prieſts, whilſt the Baptiſm of women was a performing, for decencies ſake.

Certè commodior aſperſionis uſus, & propter tempeſtatum incommoda, & propter pudorem, cujus gratiâ adhibitæ olim Diaconiſſæ mulieribus nudandis. Unde Conſtit. Apoſt. l. 8. c. 28. munus earum dicitur miniſtrare presbyteris dum baptizantur fœminæ propter decorem. Cham. *ib.*

§. 72. Nor yet (to go on ſtill with *Chamiers* words in the caſe) was the nature of the Sacrament altered for that, *For becauſe the whole vertue of the water is in ſignifying by ablution* [or *waſhing*] *it matters not how much every one is* waſhed, as [it matters] *not in the Euchariſt how much every one eats.* For *the waſhing of one part is of the ſame nature with the waſhing of the whole.*

Nec ob id fuit alterata Sacramenti natura. Nam quia tota virtus aquæ eſt in ſignificando per ablutionem, non intereſt quantum quiſque abluatur; ut in Euchariſtia non quantum quiſque comedat. Eſt enim unius partis ablutio ejuſdem naturæ cum totius ablutione. Id. ib.

§. 73. How

§. 73. How ought not Mr. *D.* here to *commune with his own heart* about his dealing thus with Authors, so as in the quoting of them, to put in, and leave out, at his pleasure, and as may best serve his interest, without regard to truth or justice; and from henceforth *to be still*, and deal no more so injuriously with any, as he hath done with *Chamier*?

§. 74. The Rere of this Squadron is brought up by Dr. *Hammond*, a man of that singular goodness as well as Learning, as was able to give credit to any party that he should appear to own, or but countenance. And therefore he, as the best, is reserved for the last. 'I might, 'saith Mr. *Danvers*, add many more, but shall conclude 'with that observable Remark, that Dr. *Hammond* gives 'us hereon, in his Annotations upon *John* 13. 10. Telling 'us, that βαπτισμὸς signifies an Immersion or washing of the whole body, which answereth to the Hebrew word טבילה, used for dipping in the Old Testament. And 'therefore upon *Matth.* 3. 1. tells us, that *John baptized* 'in a River, *viz. Jordan*. *Mark* 1. 5. in *a confluence of* 'much water, as Ænon. *John* 3. 22. That as the Greeks 'called the *Lakes*, where they used to wash, Κολυμβήθρας, 'so the Ancients called their *Baptisterions*, or vessels con-'taining their Baptismal water *Columbethras*, *i. e.* swim-'ming or diving places, being made very large with Par-'titions for Men, and Women. And upon *Mark* 7. 4. 'tells us, that the Washing or Baptizing of *Cups*, *Vessels*, 'Beds, *&c.* was no other than a putting them into the 'water all over, rinsing them.

§. 75. I believe he may add many more, and to as little purpose, as any thing that yet hath been produced. But as to his Triumphant Conclusion with that observable *Remark* from Dr. *Hammond*, thereto I shall answer by degrees.

§. 76. And first, that if Dr. *Hammond* did say, That βαπτισμὸς did signifie an Immersion, or washing of the whole Body, though in the place mentioned, *Joh.* 3. 10. he

he doth not ſtrictly ſay thoſe words, no not in his firſt Edition, but theſe [*The Hebrews had their βαπτισμὸς, or λόσεις, and their νίψεις. the former, waſhing of the whole Body, which they call* טבילה, *the other of the hands or feet, which they call* קרוש, *ſanctifying:*] and thoſe words [*and anſwereth to the Hebrew word* טבילה, *uſed for dipping in the Old Teſtament*] are none of Dr. *Hammonds*, at leaſt not in that place, yet it doth not follow, even upon ſuppoſition of his ſo ſaying, that he did think it ſignified nothing elſe, nor any otherwiſe than to immerſe: but that as ſometimes it might ſignifie immerſion, ſo ſometimes it might ſignifie alſo a perfuſion, or an affuſion. And the rather, if, as Mr. *Danvers* tells us, the Dr. ſaid it did anſwer to that *Hebrew* word, which I have ſhown in theſe Papers, as well to ſignifie in general *lotion* or *waſhing*, as in ſpecial *immerſion* or *dipping*. Nay, to take notice of that, before we paſs any further, it is obſervable, that whereas both to the *Greek* word βαπτισμὸς, and to the *Engliſh* word *Immerſion*, Dr. *Hammond* adds other words, *viz.* λόσεις, to the firſt, (in *Edit.* 1.) and *waſhing* to the ſecond, thoſe added words are both of a general import, and the addition of them might *intimate*, that the Doctor thought the word βαπτισμὸς not to be ſo confined to that particular way of dipping, as that it might not alſo ſignifie in a more general way any waſhing. And if, which is the moſt that can be ſaid, ſtill that waſhing, which the Doctor meant by βαπτισμὸς, was of the whole body; To this any one may eaſily reply, That there may be a waſhing of the whole body without an immerſion of it. And to go but a while in a Meadow naked in a good ſhowr of Rain, will afford an experiment able to evince the truth hereof even to ſenſe.

§. 77. And as the Doctor doth no where ſay (that I find in him) that βαπτισμὸς doth ſignifie nothing elſe but immerſion (how frequently ſoever he grants it to ſignifie *that*:) ſo whereas he had before, in the 1. *Edit.* of his Annotations on *Joh.* 13. 10. divided the *Hebrew* waſhings into

into two sorts, their βαπτισμὸς or λόσεις, and their νίψεις, the former the washing of the whole Body, and the other of the hands or feet, *&c.* in his *Review*, and consequently in the following Editions, and particularly in the Third, which I have by me, he doth divide them into their λόσεις, and their βαπτισμὸς or νίψεις; the former, *viz.* λόσεις, the washing of the whole Body, the other two, *viz.* βαπτισμὸς and νίψεις of the hands or feet, of one *part* alone, either by immersion, or pouring on of water. And again afterward he saith, *All that is needful to him* [viz. *the* λελυμένῳ] *is the* βαπτισμοὶ or νίψεις, the *immersion*, or *pouring on of water*. By which alteration of his words, from making βαπτισμοὶ to be synonymous with λόσεις, which he makes (amongst the *Jews*) to signifie the washing of the whole body, to the making of it to be synonymous with νίψεις, which he makes to signifie the washing of the hands or feet, and that either by immersion, or affusion, is clearly shewed, that the Doctor in his *second thoughts* was of opinion, that βαπτισμὸς did not so strictly signifie immersion, but that it was extendible also to other significations, even so far as to signifie a washing in general, however performed, either by immersion or affusion. And according to the later more correct sentiment of the Doctor, in reason and ingenuity should Mr. *D.* have quoted him, if he knew of it. For so would Mr. *Danvers* be done unto himself.

§. 78. And in further confirmation hereof the Doctor tells us (on *Mark* 7. 4.) differently in the later Editions from what he had said in the first, that the word βαπτίζεσθαι here used, as it differs from νίπτεσθαι, *ver.* 3. signifies not only the washing of the *whole body* —— but washing *any part*, as the hands here, by way of immersion in water, as that is opposed to affusion or pouring water on them. And adds from Dr. *Pocock*, that all the difference observable between טבל and נטל was, that the former noted immersion, the other affusion of water, *both* indifferently used of *any part*, both sometimes for *any kind of* wash-

washing that part. So that if βαπτίζεσθαι answer to טבל (as Mr. *Danvers* makes the Doctor to say it doth) then the former, as well as the latter, must signifie any kind of washing of that, whereto it is applied, which is the thing we contend for. And though the Doctor say of βαπτίζεσθαι, as it differs from νίπτεσθαι, that it signifies immersion, yet that hinders not but that, as טבל, which just so differs from נטל, is put to signifie indifferently any kind of washing, (*viz.* when it is not set in contradistinct on unto נטל) so βαπτίζεσθαι, though when set in contradistinction unto νίπτεσθαι, it signifie *immersion*, yet when it is not so set, it may signifie in general any kind of washing: nothing being more ordinary in the use of words, than such kind of Synecdoches as those, whereby both the *Genus* is put for the *Species*, and the *Species* for the *Genus*, and even sometimes one *Species* for another; as when *Homer*, *Virgil*, or *Ovid* call that armour *brassy*, which was made of *iron*; or that *irony*, which was made of *brass*.

§. 79. As for that which Mr. *Danvers* saith, the Doctor tells us (upon *Matth.* 3. 1.) of *John's* baptizing in a River, viz. *Jordan*, *Mark* 1. 5. and in a confluence of much water, as Ænon, *Joh.* 3. 23. Because, it is added, *there was much water there*; and so for that, which he saith upon *Mark* 7. 4. of the *washing*, or baptizing of *Cups*, *Vessels*, *Beds*, *&c.* I have spoken to it elsewhere, and I hope to the satisfaction of the Reader.

§. 80. And as to the Ancients calling their *Baptisteries*, or Vessels containing their Baptismal Water by the same name, whereby the *Greeks* called their *Lakes*, where they used to wash, viz, *Columbethras*, *i. e.* swimming or diving places; I answer, that the ancient manner of publick and solemn baptizing being much after the *Jewish* way of Immersion, it was not only convenient, but necessary, that the *Baptisteries* or Fonts, should be made of such capacity, as that the baptized might be immersed therein; and this the Doctor declares, and no body denies. But this does not do the Dippers business, nor prove that Dr.

Hammond ever denied, or intended by any thing he said to deny, or imply a denyal of any's being baptized among the Ancients otherwise than by immersion. The Doctor knew better things than so. For to grant that publick Baptism was administred by immersion, doth not affirm that private Baptism was so administred; to grant that Persons in health were dipped, doth not affirm that Persons in sickness were so baptized too. In short, unless these two things can be made good, which yet never can be, first that none were ever baptized amongst the ancients, but in the publick *Baptisterions* (none in private Houses, none in Prisons, none in their Beds;) Secondly, that even in those publick *Baptisterions* none were ever baptized but by a total immersion, and that it did not suffice to some Persons, and in some places, to have their Heads only dipped, all the Doctor's discourse of the largeness of the ancient *Columbethras* makes nothing to the confirmation of the Dipper's supposition. It is one thing to talk of what is done in *ordinary* and common cases, and another thing to talk of what is *extraordinary*, and but done upon special emergency, and the proof of the one is no disproving of the other.

§ 81. Secondly, I answer, that whatever Dr. *Hammond* said, either of the word βαπτίζω, or of the ancient manner of baptizing, he did not hold all Baptism unlawful, but that which was administred by a Total immersion. And this, if his published Writings did not declare it, I should be able to make good out of his private. For taking notice of what he said of these things, and foreseeing what use would by the *Anabaptists* be made of what he said, I did by Letter advertise him thereof; and he again by Letter to me did not only clear his own discourses of the strict import of βαπτίζω from giving any advantage to the Dippers, but also lay down several grounds, whereon the Church proceeded to use sprinkling instead of dipping. And because the communication of so much of those Letters of his as concerns the present debate, might tend, as I thought,

thought, to the ſatisfaction of the *Reader*, as well as to the vindication of the *Doctor*, I once had thought to have made ſo much of his Letters publick. But ſeeing his *publick* writings do declare it, and particularly his *Pract. Catechiſm*, *l. 6. S. 2. p.* 154. *Edit.* 1674. where he ſaith, that by *Chriſt's appointment*, whoſoever ſhould be thus received into his Family, ſhould be received with this Ceremony of Water, therein to *be dipt*, (*i. e.* according to the Primitive ancient cuſtom to be put under water) three times, *or* inſtead of that, to be *ſprinkled* with it —— Therefore I ſhall, as thinking it a needleſs thing, ſuperſede the *Reader* all further trouble about them.

§. 82. And thus I have (fairly I think) cleared the Field of this firſt Squadron. I ſhall, after a little pauſe for refreſhment of the *Reader*, attack the Second.

CHAP. XII.

Anſwers to Authorities produced by Mr. Danvers *from Commentators, &c.*

§. 1. THE Second *Squadron* conſiſts moſt of *Commentators*, and marches under the Banner of *Holy Scripture*: ſeveral Texts whereof Mr. *Danvers* diſplays before them. To their motions I ſhall now pay my attendance.

§. 2. Secondly, (ſaith Mr. *D.*) 'It appears to be ſo 'from the practice and uſage we find hereof in *Scripture*, 'and the Opinion of the *Learned* upon it.

§. 3. Whether there be any rational ground from what appears, to conclude what was, or ought to be, will be ſeen in the Iſſue. But what it is, let's have it.

First (saith he) in the Story of Christs baptism, we read, *Matth.* 3. 5. (it should be *v.* 13.) 'That *Jesus came* '*from* Galilee *to* Jordan *unto* John, *to be baptized of him.* 'And v. 16. *And when he was baptized, he went up straight-* '*way out of the water.*

'§. 4. The Learned *Cajetan* upon the place, saith, Christ 'ascended out of the water; therefore Christ was baptized 'by *John*, not by Sprinkling or pouring Water upon him, 'but by Immersion, that is, by dipping or plunging in the 'water.

§. 5. To the Text I have already spoke, in *ch.* 10. I shall now therefore speak to the Cardinal.

§. 6. And that *Cardinal* (who, no doubt, was learned enough to deserve that Emphatical Title of *the Learned*, and from an Anabaptist, especially when he seems to speak for Dipping in Baptism) doth indeed make such Collection, that because of its being said, that *Jesus straightway went up out of the water*, therefore he was baptized by *John*, not by Sprinkling, or pouring water upon him from above, but by dipping in, or bowing down his body. But this *Learned mans* assertion being founded on a reason, his word can be of no more weight than his reason is. But his reason is none, as I have shewed in these Papers, *ch.* 10. Nor could all the Learning he had ever prove, from Christs ascending ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, *ab aquâ* (as *Musculus*, the next Author that Mr. *D.* here cites, doth render it) *from the water* (as that is in the Original; which in his Translation is *de aqua*, in ours, *out of the water*) that Christ was baptized by a total immersion. It follows therefore that his word is nothing also. And so with this I might dismiss him.

§. 7. But further, having consulted that *Author* himself, and the place here quoted, I find something, not taken notice of by Mr. *D.* or thought fit by him to be slipped by, that makes the Cardinal seem not altogether so peremptory in his Conclusion, which is, that having said, Jesus was baptized by *John*, *per immersionem*, that is, by dipping,

ping, he adds, *ſeu ſubmiſſionem corporis*, which Mr. *D.* Engliſhes not, unleſs plunging in the water be the Engliſh of it with him: but it ſignifies only a bowing down of the body. And who knows but that the Cardinal might ſpeak thoſe words by way of Correction of, or explication to what went before, and intend only thereby, that he bowed down his body in order to the having of his *head only* dipped in water, which hath been ſince, if it were never before that, a way of baptizing. And if this be the meaning of the Phraſe, then the Cardinal having propoſed two ways, and having determined for neither, cannot be produced as a poſitive witneſs for either: unleſs by him, that will do as Mr. *D.* hath done, and leave what makes againſt him, out.

Baptizatus autem Jeſus conſeſtim aſcendit de aqua] *Non ergo per aſperſionem aut deſuper effuſionem, ſed per immerſionem ſeu ſubmiſſionem corporis baptizatus eſt Jeſus in Jordane.* Cajetan, *in Matth.* 3. 16.

§. 8. But were it ſo, as Mr. *D.* makes the Cardinal ſay, and that by *ſubmiſſionem* he meant nothing more, nor other than what he meant by *immerſion* (though thoſe words are far enough from being Synonymous,) yet it doth not follow, that it muſt be neceſſarily ſo with us too: unleſs there were a neceſſity of our conformity with Chriſt in all his Sacramental Circumſtances, which I think our Anabaptiſts will not ſay we ſhould, no not in thoſe which concern Baptiſm. For then we muſt not be baptized till above thirty years of Age; we muſt be unmarried when baptized; we muſt be baptized no where but in a River, and that River muſt be *Jordan*: in which circumſtances yet ſome have been more zealous, than judicious imitators of him.

In the mean time it may be taken notice of, that by Baptiſm the learned *Cardinal* underſtood an *Ablution*. Therefore in *v.* 5. of this Chapter, upon the word [*Baptizabantur*] he ſaith, the old Greek word remained among the Latines in their Eccleſiaſtick Myſteries, and that it ought to have been *abluebantur*, and that *John* himſelf did exerciſe *miniſterium abluendi*, and that the ſinners offered

themselves, *abluendos à Joanne, tanquam exterior ablutio esset quædam professio pœnitentiæ, & mundæ deinceps vitæ ducendæ,* to be washed by *John*, as if the external washing were a kind of profession of repentance and a new life thenceforth to be led. So that with him *washing* seems to have been the most material thing in *Johns* Baptism: and then no question, but that where that is, the *Cardinal* will allow of a Baptism, though it be not performed by a total immersion.

§. 9. From *Cajetan* Mr. *D.* passeth on to *Musculus*; and saith he, *Musculus* on *Matth.* 3. calls Baptism Dipping, and saith, 'the Parties baptized were *dipped*, not *sprinkled*.

§. 10. But he telleth us not on what verse of that Chapter; nor in what Page of that Volume he saith it. The discovery had saved me some time, and labour in searching. And what is the worst of it, after all my pains in reading two and twenty pages *in folio*, with care to find the place, and all those places where there seemed to be any probability of finding it, twice over, all the Return I can make upon my Inquest is this, *Non est inventus*, there is no such place or passage in all that *Musculus* saith on that Chapter, that I could find.

Adumbrat enim externa illa tinctio, & mystica ablutio quæ fit in corpore renovationem mentium & ablutionem sordium, &c. Baptisma quo tincti sunt & Christus, & Christiani, p. 28. *Baptismus quo non mentes sed corpora tinguntur, p.* 36.

§. 11. This indeed there is, that he uses the word *tinctio* for baptizing in several places. But surely *tinctio* doth not signifie precisely dipping, but wetting, or dying, be it what way it will that a thing is wetted or dyed; whether by dipping into, or pouring on, that which wetteth or dyeth. And I have shewed in these Papers, that as *tingo* is sometimes put to signifie baptizing in general however performed, *viz.* when it stands alone: so it is sometimes put to signifie baptizing by Sprinkling or pouring on water in particular, and in opposition to dipping. His calling baptism then *tinction*, if that be it which Mr. *D.* means, no more proves his calling it dipping, than sprinkling. §. 12. But

§. 12. But as for his saying, *that the Parties baptized were dipped not ſprinkled*, there is no ſuch thing ſaid by him there. And I cannot but wonder with what confidence Mr. *D.* ſhould ſay any ſuch thing. Had I ſaid it, a crime would have been charged on me; which out of reſpect and honour to that Gentleman, becauſe a Gentleman, though unknown to me, I ſhall forbear ſo much as to name. All I ſhall ſay is, that Truth needs no Untruths to defend it: and that the Champion that goes about by ſuch ſupports to maintain a cauſe, rather ruines it, than upholds it. And thoſe of his Party may do well to take heed how they truſt his reports from other Authors, who hath ſo unbecomingly, to ſay no worſe, miſreported this. The beſt excuſe that I can make for him is, that it is not impoſſible, but that either himſelf, or his *Amanuenſis*, might miſtake the place in writing, or that it might be amiſs ordered by the Compoſitor in the Printing (ſuch things very ordinarily happening to be:) and if that will any way ſalve his reputation, as I wiſh it may, much good d'it him with it.

§. 13. But to go on, 'A Second Scripture conſiderable 'is that of *John* 3. 23. *And* John *was baptizing in* Ænon 'near Salim (and the reaſon why he pitcht upon this place 'is given) *becauſe there was much water there.*

§. 14. To this Text I have already ſpoken in *ch.* 11. and ſo I think it needleſs to ſay any thing farther here. But——

§. 15. *Piſcator* upon the place (as Mr. *D.* tells us) 'ſays ὕδατα πολλὰ ſignifies many Rivers, as ὕδωρ in the 'ſingular number, ſignifies the River of *Jordan*: This 'ſaith he, is mentioned to ſignifie the Ceremony of Baptiſm 'which *John* uſed in dipping or plunging the whole body 'of man ſtanding in the River; whence he ſaith, Chriſt 'being baptized by *John* in *Jordan*, is ſaid to *aſcend out of* 'the Water.

§. 16. Not to trouble Mr. *D.* with asking him, how the body of a man can be plunged (which is Mr. *D*'s word, and none of *Piſcators*) in the River, whilſt he is ſtanding in it, I ſhall acknowledge *Piſcators* words to be much to

this purpose, only a little more clear. Those to the present purpose are these. *Commemoratur autem hoc ad significandum ritum Baptismi, quo Johannes utebatur, immergens scilicet totum corpus hominis in fluvio stantis. Unde Christus à Johanne in Jordane baptizatus, ex aquâ ascendisse dicitur. Matth.* 3. *v.* 16. It is not material what ὕδατα πολλὰ signifies, whether many waters, or many rivers, or much water (only by the way, if it signifie many waters, and those distinct in place, or many Rivers, it the better confirms the Notion I have of it, where I speak concerning it.) We will suppose the water, or waters deep enough for a man to be dipped in; and that it was *John's* way to baptize by dipping. But Christs ascending out of the water proves it not: as I have shewed, *ch.* 10. And though Dipping were *John's* (as well as other *Jews*) way of baptizing, yet it doth not necessarily follow, that ours must be so too, as I have shewed, *ch.* 8.

§. 17. Nor did *Piscator* think so. Else he would never have delivered it for a Theological Aphorism, That whether the Baptized Party were dipped, and that thrice or once, or were only sprinkled or wetted with water poured on, that ought to be at liberty in the Churches, according to diversity of Countries. Adding also as a reason for what he had said, for though it be certain, that the rite of dipping was observed by the ancient Church, yet the Verb βαπτίζεσθαι signifies not only to be dipped, but also to be wetted, washed, or cleansed with washing any other way. So then *Piscator* is no witness for the Anabaptists: nor his Testimony any thing to the prejudice of baptism by Sprinkling.

Cæterùm mergatúrne totus qui tingitur, idque ter an semel; an infusâ tantùm aquâ aspergatur aut perfundatur: id pro regionum diversitate Ecclesiis liberum esse debet. Etsi enim mergendi ritum veteri Ecclesiæ observatum fuisse constat: tamen verbum βαπτίζειν *non solum mergi, sed etiam quâvis aliâ ratione tingi, aut lavari ablúíve significat.* Piscat. Loc. 24. Aphorism. 9.

§. 18. *Calvin*

§. 18. *Calvin*, upon these words, saith, 'That from this place you may 'gather, that *John* and Christ administred Baptism by plunging the 'whole body into water.

Cæterùm ex his verbis colligere licet Baptismum fuisse celebratum à Johanne & Christo totius corporis submersione. Calv. *in loc.*

§. 19. I answer, It is probable they did so: and that they so did 'tis probably conjectured from this place. But first probability is no proof of certainty. Secondly, that they did administer Baptism by plunging in this place, doth not prove, that they did not administer it also by sprinkling, neither in this, nor in any other place. And without that all's nothing.

§. 20. And is this all that *Calvin* saith of the matter in this place? what then means that which follows, spoken by him as it were on purpose to prevent that ill use, that he foresaw would be made of those his words? *Notwithstanding we ought not with so great anxiety to trouble our selves about the external rite, so it do but agree with the spiritual truth, and the Appointment and Rule of the Lord.* And I hope it doth sufficiently elsewhere appear in these Papers, that there is no discongruity betwixt those things, and the now prevailing Ceremony. And so Mr. *Calvins* name is but used here for the Authority of his name (which is truly great) against himself, and those that follow that way now, which he followed in his time and Church; on what design Mr. *D.* knows, and with how much ingenuity let others judge. But we shall have more of this presently.

Quanquam de externo ritu minus anxiè laborandum est, modò cum spirituali veritate & Domini instituto ac regulâ congruat. Calv. *in loc.*

§. 21. A Third Scripture worthy our notice, is *Acts* 8. 36, 38. '*As they went on their way, they came to a certain* 'water; *and the Eunuch said, see here is water; and they* 'both went down into the water, both Philip *and the Eunuch,* 'and he baptized him; *and when they were come up out of the* 'water: Upon which place,

§. 22. *Calvin*

§. 22. *Calvin* saith, '*We see what fashion the Ancients* '*had to administer Baptism; for they plunged the whole Body* '*into the Water: The use is now*, saith he, *that the Minister casts a few drops of Water only upon the Body, or upon the Head.*

§. 23. To this Scripture my Answer will be given in *ch.* 14. Perhaps Reader you may wonder why I refer my Answers to these Scriptures to other places, and answer them not here, where it might seem most proper to answer them. Know therefore, that these Three Chapters, which contain Answers to the Authorities alledged by Mr. *Danvers*, are postnate to the rest of the Treatise; which was gone out of my hand before much of these Three Chapters was finished: and so these Scriptures being considered in other places of the Treatise, I think it needless to say any thing to them here; and that I make not particular References, is because I have neither the Treatise, nor so much as any Copy of it by me, whereby I might be enabled to give certain Directions. Herein therefore I humbly beg a favourable construction of my doings. And now to what is alledged from Mr. *Calvin*; I answer,

§. 24. First, That Mr. *Calvin* doth not say, that we here see, what was the *only fashion* of baptizing the Ancients had: but *what rite* of baptizing *was* among the Ancients. That dipping was one fashion we shall give them leave to believe: but that it was the only fashion, is the dispute, and not proved from hence.

§. 25. Secondly, Mr. *Calvin*'s saying, *Hîc perspicimus*, we see here, is no proof that dipping was the Ancient way of baptizing, unless it were to be seen here. But that no such thing is here to be seen, I shall make sufficiently to appear, *chap.* 14. And so this place, on that supposition, is nothing to the purpose.

§. 26. Thirdly, This place is an intimation, that the use for the Minister to sprinkle (not as Mr. *D.* renders it *to cast a few drops* only *on*) the Body or Head was formerly in being. First, because he calls it *an use*; and that must have

have ſome time to be begun in, and continued in to make it an uſe. And ſecondly, becauſe he ſaith (not as Mr. *D.* renders him) the uſe is, but *invaluit uſus*, it was grown to be an uſe, or the uſe that was begun was grown ſtrong, and had gained confirmation by cuſtome, for the Miniſter to baptize by ſprinkling.

§. 27. Fourthly, Was Mr. *Calvin* againſt ſprinkling in Baptiſm, by any thing that appears in this place? Far be it from any to think ſo. It had been more ingenuous in Mr. *D.* to have given us the reſt that follows: wherein Mr. *Calvin* ſpeaks as much to the purpoſe in vindication of ſprinkling, as any Rhantiſt, as ſome call thoſe that are for baptizing by ſprinkling, would deſire. Which becauſe Mr. *D.* has not done, as well for vindication of Mr. *Calvin*, as the truth, I will do it.

§. 28. But (ſaith he) ſo little a difference of a Ceremony, ought not to be of that eſteem with us, as that for it we ſhould rend the Church, or trouble it with Brawls. Truly for the Ceremony of Baptiſm it ſelf, in as much as it was delivered to us by Chriſt, we ought to fight to the death an hundred times over, rather than ſuffer it to be taken away from us. But ſeeing that in the Symbol of water we have teſtimony as well of our waſhing, as of our new life: Seeing that in the water, as in a Looking-glaſs, Chriſt repreſents unto us his Blood, that from thence we may ſeek our cleanſing: ſeeing that he teacheth, that we are faſhioned again by his Spirit, that being dead to ſin we may live to righteouſneſs; it is certain that we want nothing which can make for the ſubſtance of Baptiſm.

Cæterùm, non tanti eſſe nobis debet tantillum Cæremoniæ diſcrimen, ut eccleſiam propterea ſcindamus, vel rixis turbemus. Pro ipſa quidem Baptiſmi Cæremonia, quatenus nobis à Chriſto tradita eſt, centies potius ad mortem uſque digladiandum, quàm ut eam nobis eripi ſinamus. Sed quum in aquæ ſymbolo teſtimonium habemus tam ablutionis noſtræ, quàm novæ vitæ: quum in aqua velut in ſpeculo, ſanguinem nobis ſuum Chriſtus repræſentat, ut munditiem inde noſtram petamus: quum docet nos ſpiritu ſuo refingi, ut mortui peccato juſtitiæ vivamus: nihil quod ad Baptiſmi ſubſtantiam faciat deeſſe no-

Where-

bis certum est. Quare ab initio liberè sibi permisit Ecclesia, extra hanc substantiam ritus habere paululum dissimiles. Nam alii ter, alii autem semel tantùm mergebant: quare non est quòd in rebus non ita necessariis nimiùm morosi simus: modò ne adventitiæ pompæ simpliccm Christi institutionem contaminent.

Wherefore from the beginning the Church took free liberty to it self, save in this substance, to have rites a little unlike. For some dipped thrice, but some only once: wherefore we have no reason in things of not so great necessity to be too morose, so that adventitious pomps do not defile the plain institution of Christ.

Calvin. *in* Act. 8. 36.

O that our Dippers would but be so tender as not to rend and trouble the Church about so little a difference as this is. Sure they would not be so stiff about it, if they did not think, that whilest we have not the Ceremony of dipping, we want something that is of the substance of the Sacrament, which is quite contrary to the judgment of their here-appealed-unto witness, Mr. *Calvin*: who looks upon it as one of those things which are not so necessary; and thinks that the present Church may, as the Primitive Church did, and (mark that) *from the beginning* allow it self some liberty in the use of several, not greatly differing Rites and Ceremonies.

§. 29. A fourth Scripture we shall mention, is *Rom.* 6. 4. '*Buried with him in Baptism*: *Where the Apostle elegantly* '*alludes to the Ceremony of Baptizing in our Death and Re-* '*surrection with Christ.*

§. 30. *Cajetan* upon the place, saith, '*Thus we are bu-* '*ried with him by Baptism into Death: By our burying he* '*declares our death from the Ceremony of Baptism; because* '*he who is baptized, is put under the Water, and by this car-* '*ries a similitude of him that is buried, who is put under the* '*Earth. Now because none are buried but dead men, from* '*this very thing that we are buried in Baptism, we are assi-* '*milated to Christ buried, or when he was buried.*

§. 31. To

§ 31. To the Text, I anſwer, Firſt, That it is plain by it, that there was ſuch a cuſtome in thoſe days, as to baptize by immerſion, which carried a very ſenſible ſhew of a Burial, and a Reſurrection. But the Negative cannot be thence concluded, that there was no other way of baptizing, but that. Nor is it probable there was no other way: Firſt, becauſe there are other Texts of Scripture, which allude to ſprinkling in Baptiſm, as this doth to dipping. And the like Collection muſt be allowed to be made from the one, that is made from the other. Secondly, becauſe there may be, and is a baptiſmal repreſentation made of a burial, and of a Reſurrection, not only in partial merſation, but in aſperſion or affuſion of water, as well as in immerſion, as we ſhall more at large ſhew hereafter.

§ 32. And now to the *Cardinal*, I anſwer, that not having the Book by me to examine, I muſt ſtand to the *Quoter*'s ingenuity for the Truth of the Quotation; which yet if truly made, is not much to the *Quoter*'s advantage. All that I can find in it to the purpoſe, is in theſe words. [*He who is baptized, is put under the water, and by this carries a ſimilitude of him that is buried.*] But what makes this againſt ſprinkling? or what more for dipping, than for ſprinkling? He that is dipped is put under the water. True: And where is he put that is ſprinkled? Above it? That were a new faſhion of baptizing indeed. In ſhort, he that is ſprinkled, as well as he that is dipped, is put under the water, and the water's falling upon him that is ſprinkled, fairly repreſents the Earth's falling upon him that is buried; and ſo in ſprinkling, as well as in dipping, there is a ſimilitude of a burial, and by the one as well as by the other, we may be ſaid to be buried with Chriſt by Baptiſm into Death. And ſo the *Cardinal*'s teſtimony might have been ſpared, unleſs to fill up room, and make a ſhew, being every whit as much for us, as it is for them that are againſt us.

§ 33. If

§. 33. If it be replied, that by putting under water the *Cardinal* meant such a putting under water as is done in a total immersion, and not by affusion or aspersion; I answer; it may be, or may not be so, for ought I know. But however, that affirmative, that he that is put so under the water carries a similitude of a burial, doth not imply a negative of the contrary in it, that none carries a similitude of a burial, but he that is so put under the water. That representation is made both ways, though in the one it is more lively than in the other. And so the passage is impertinent, and proves nothing.

§. 34. *Keckerman* (as Mr. *D.* tells us) in his *Syst. Theol. l.* 3. *c.* 8. says, '*That Immersion, not Aspersion, was the* '*first Institution of Baptism, as it doth plainly appear from* '*Rom.* 6. 3.

§. 35. To that purpose *Keckerman* doth indeed speak in that place. Yet that he nevertheless did not think Immersion necessary, abundantly appears in the same place: which for the vindication of him, I will set down at large, since Mr. *D.* thought good only to pick so much out of him as might serve for his turn, and intitle *Keckerman* to a piece of Patronship to *Anabaptism*.

Baptismus est Sacramentum N. T. quo aquæ perfusione in nomine Patris & Filii & S. S. factâ significatur & obsignatur fidelibus beneficium purgationis à peccato per filium Dei, & regenerationis ad vitam æternam. Keck. *Syst. Theol. l.* 3. *c.* 8.

§. 36. Coming to give the Definition of Baptism, he doth it thus. Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, wherein by a perfusion of Water made in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, there is signified and sealed to the Faithful the benefit of Purgation from sin by the Son of God, and of Regeneration unto Eternal Life.

Etsi Baptismus propriè significet immersionem; & in vetere etiam Ecclesia per regiones Ori-

§. 37. And going to set down the Canons of Baptism, his second he makes to be this. Though Baptism do properly signifie immersion, and in

in the ancient Church throughout the Eaſtern Countries, baptiſm was adminiſtred not by aſperſion, but by immerſion: yet in the colder Countries of Chriſtendom ſprinkling is entertained in ſtead of immerſion by reaſon of Infants: becauſe Charity and Neceſſity diſpenſe with Ceremonies, and temper them with a kind of ἐπιείκεια [moderation, clemency, gentleneſs] as far as it may be done with ſafety to the Analogy.

cutiù non adſperſione ſed immerſione Baptiſmus celebrabatur, tamen in regionibus Chriſtianiſſimi frigidioribus adſperſio loco immerſionis recepta eſt propter infantes; quia charitas & neceſſitas diſpenſant de Ceremoniis eaſque ἐπιεικείᾳ quadam temperant, quatenus id ſalvâ ἀναλογίᾳ fieri poteſt. Keckerm. *ib.*

§. 38. Then proceeding to a Note upon this Canon, he ſets down that, which Mr. *D.* quotes from him, which is this, as it ſtands all together in him. *We cannot deny, but that the firſt inſtitution of Baptiſm ſtood in immerſion, and not in aſperſion, as plainly appears from* Rom. 6. 3, 4. But becauſe the *firſt inſtitution of Baptiſm was made in a hotter Country, and becauſe at that time, adult perſons were moſtly baptized, therefore the Church might diſpenſe with this Ceremony in colder Countries, and at this time when Infants moſtly, and ſeldom any adult are baptized: eſpecially ſeeing the Analogy of ſignification remains, and filths are waſhed away too with that ſprinkling: and ſeeing that man was not made for Baptiſm, but Baptiſm for man, ſo as that by reaſon of the neceſſity of Infants Charity might be able to change ſomething in that Rite, eſpecially ſince* βαπτισμὸς *and* βάπτισμα

Non poſſumus diffiteri primam inſtitutionem Baptiſmi in immerſione, non verò aſperſione conſtitiſſe, quod diſertè patet ex cap. 6. Rom. *verſu tertio & quarto. Sed quia prima inſtitutio Baptiſmi facta eſt in regione calidiori, & quia tunc temporis potiſſimùm baptizabantur adulti, ideo de hâc Cæremoniâ in regionibus frigidioribus, & bon tempore, quo infantes plerumque, rariſſimè adulti baptizantur, potuit Eccleſia diſpenſare: præſertim cùm ἀναλογία ſignificationis maneat; & adſperſione etiam ſordes abluantur; cúmque etiam non homo propter Baptiſmum, ſed Baptiſmus propter hominum factus ſit, ut propter neceſſitatem infantum Charitas aliquid in ritu*

illo potuerit mutare. Præsertim cum βαπτισμὸς & ῥάντισμα sit à verbo βαπτίζω, quod est à ῥάπτω: ῥάπτω autem non tantùm immergo, sed & aspergo significat. Keck. *ib.*

is from the Verb βαπτίζω, and that is from ῥάπτω: but ῥάπτω signifies not only to dip, but also to sprinkle.

§. 39. What would we have any man say more for Sprinkling, than is said by this Author produced by Mr. *D.* as a witness against it, and for dipping? His judgment is so clear and full in the case, that without any remarks made on him I might fairly leave the consideration thereof to the Impartial Reader. And I wonder Mr. *Danvers*'s heart aked not, when he read this, and yet resisted it.

§. 40. Yet it may not be amiss to note some few things, as First, That admitting Immersion to have been the first institution of Baptism, that hinders not but that Asperson might come up presently after it, even in the Apostles days; and that there is fair appearance of it, in *Heb.* 10. 22. as is elsewhere shewed in these Papers. Secondly, that it doth not appear from *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. that the first institution of Baptism stood in Immersion, and not Asperson. It appears from thence, that Immersion was a way of baptizing then, but it doth not thence appear, that Immersion was the *only* way, that they did baptize by; nor that Asperson was not then in use too as well as Immersion; nor yet which of them was first. Thirdly, that the Author doth not say, that anciently through the Universal Church baptism was administred only by Immersion, but only *through the Eastern Countries*. Fourthly, that the Reasons on which he founds the change of this Rite in these colder Countries, *viz.* necessity and charity, are such, as the most positive Laws of God, even those for the *Sabbath* and *Circumcision*, have given way unto, as we shall further shew afterward. And if a substantial part of Divine Laws have given way to them, then much more may a Circumstantial part of them. Thus much for *Keckerman*.

§. 41. The

§. 41. The next charge is given by three at once, and those Men of renoun, *Diodat. Grotius*, and *Davenant*. 'Diodat. (saith he) *Annot.* on *Rom.* 6. 4. *Grotius* on the same, 'Davenant, *Col.* 2. 12. do own dipping to have been the 'Rite in Christ's time.

§. 42. Mr. *Danvers* had done well to have given us their words, and not only have mustered up their names. For, for my part, I cannot find in them, what he quotes from them.

§. 43. Mr. *Diodati* hath these words in the place quoted, *viz.* Rom. 6. 4. *In baptism being dipped in water according to the ancient Ceremony, it is a sacred figure unto us, that sin ought to be drowned in us by God's Spirit: as that it is a Seal unto us of the washing of our Souls before God.* But now in which of these words doth he express, or imply, that dipping was *the Rite in Christ's time? Christ's time* is not so much as mentioned in the whole passage. So then the words can speak nothing for the time they do not mention.

§. 44. But it is called *the Ancient Ceremony*. *An ancient Ceremony* acknowledgedly it is. And so it might be, yet not so ancient as Christ's time. There have been ancient Rites in the Church, which yet have not reached up so far. And as for the Particle *the*, if any stress be laid upon that, as if thereby were meant, that it is *the only* ancient Ceremony, and so must needs reach up to Christ's time; I answer, that not having the Author's writing in its original Language by me. I cannot tell, whether he expressed any thing, that necessarily did import so much; and if it chance so to be that he did not, then his words, as they are translated, are of no force: but if he did, then I cannot but question, whether there be in them any truth: in as much as I have in these Papers made it evident, that there were other Ceremonies anciently in use, as well as dipping; and their first original being not to be found, they are rationally believed to have been from the beginning; and the contrary thereunto cannot be demonstrated. And so

this Testimony is either untrue, or impertinent.

§. 45. In short, this *Author* doth not here determine Immersion to be the *sole* Ceremony that indispensably is to be used in Baptism; but he declares what is designed by that Ceremony, where it is used; and in that he hath none to contradict him.

§. 46. The like I say by *Grotius*. His words on that place, mention nothing of Christ's time (unless any would think his time to have extended it self as far as to St. *Paul*'s writing his Epistle to the *Romans*, who was dead and gone many Years before:) and so do not prove, what they are quoted for. He tells us indeed, that not only the words, but form of Baptism do intimate a representation to be made of the Burial of Christ; the total immersing of the Body so far under the water, as to be for a while covered thereby from sight, bearing a certain Image (as he saith) of that Burial, which is given to the Dead: and its rising again from under the water, bearing an Image or shew of Christ's rising again. And this we freely grant, where it is so administred. But as he doth not say, so neither do we grant, that it is not signified any other way, yea we shew the contrary in these Papers. It is very probable, or rather certain, that such a way of baptizing was in use among the *Romans*, in as much as the Apostle alludes thereto, as a thing known amongst them; and makes Inferences there-from for the instructing of them. But that is not the question in hand: but whether that was the *only* way, not there only, but throughout the whole Christian World. If it were not so, then can no Argument thence be drawn to the evacuating of other ways of baptizing. And if it were so, yet still, unless the Church had no power to vary at any time from what was before time, in the

Ostendit non verba tantum Baptismi, sed & ipsam ejus formam hoc innuere. Nam immersio totius corporis in flumen, ita ut non conspicerctur amplius, imaginem gerebat sepulturæ quæ datur mortuis. Sic Col. 2. 12. συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι. Grot. *in Rom. 6. 4.*

acciden-

accidentals and circumſtantials of worſhip, other ways of baptizing inſtituted and approved of by the Church, will be lawful.

§. 47. And as for *Davenant*, he ſaith not a word tending that way, *viz.* to prove dipping to have been *the* (*i. e.* the only) Rite in Chriſt's time: but rather the quite contrary. For having ſaid, that in Baptiſm, when the Party baptized is let down into the water, thereby is deſigned the burial of the Body of ſins, or the old *Adam*; as the Reſurrection, when he is brought out; he adds this as a reaſon: *In veteri enim Eccleſia non tingebant ſolummodo, ſed in aquam immergebant eos, quos baptizabant.* For in the ancient Church they did not only tinge, but immerſe into water, thoſe whom they baptized. I have ſhewed that *tingo*, though when it is ſet alone, it is often put to ſignifie baptizing in general, whether by dipping or ſprinkling, yet when it is ſet in oppoſition to dipping, it ſignifies only ſprinkling, or ſome other way of baptizing diſtinct from dipping. So then, as this Author ſpeaks not at all of *Chriſt's time* in particular, but only of the ancient Church in general, ſo what he ſpeaks of that time, reaches as well to ſprinkling, as to dipping, and aſſerts the antiquity of the one, as well as of the other. *Non tingebant ſolummodo, ſed immergebant*, ſignifies plainly, that they did both *tingere* and *immergere*. And if both were Rites in that time, then was not only one of them, namely dipping, *the*, *i. e.* the only Rite in that time. And ſo Mr. *D.* gains nothing to his cauſe by the Teſtimony of this no leſs learned, than honourable Father of our Church.

§. 48. After this triumvirate of learned Men follows a Man, who alone was a *triumvir* in Learning, 'Tilenus, (a 'learned Proteſtant Writer, as Mr. *D.* himſelf ſtiles him) 'and he in his Diſputation, *p.* 886, 889, 890. gives, as Mr. '*D.* tells us a moſt remarkable teſtimony in the caſe. Bap-'tiſm, ſaith he, is the firſt Sacrament of the New Teſta-'ment inſtituted by Chriſt, in which with a moſt pat and 'exact Analogy between the ſign and the thing ſignified,

'those that are in Covenant are by the Minister washed in 'Water. The outward Rite in Baptism is three-fold; 1. 'Immersion into the Water. 2. Abiding under the water. '3. Resurrection out of the water. The form of Baptism, '*viz.* Internal and Essential, is no other than the Analogi-'cal proportion, which the signs keep with the things sig-'nified thereby. For the properties of water in washing 'away the defilements of the Body, do in a most suitable 'similitude set forth the efficacy of Christ's blood in blot-'ting out of sin; so dipping into the Water doth in a most 'lively similitude set forth the mortification of the old man; 'and rising out of the Water, the vivification of the New. 'The same plunging into the Water, holds forth to us that 'horrible gulf of Divine Justice, in which Christ for our 'sins sake (which he took upon him) was for a while in a 'manner swallowed up. Abiding under water, how little 'a while soever, denotes his descent into Hell, even the 'very deepest of lifelesness, while lying in the sealed and 'guarded Sepulcher, he was accounted as one dead. Ri-'sing out of the Water, holds out to us a lively similitude 'of that Conquest, which this Dead man got over Death, 'which he vanquished in his own Den, (as it were) that is 'the Grave. In like manner therefore (saith he) it is meet 'that we being baptized into his death, and buried with 'him, should also rise with him, and so go on in newness of 'life. *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. *Coloss.* 2. 12.

§. 49. I close with Mr. *D.* in his judgment of *Tilenus*, that he was a *learned Protestant* Writer, and also that he gives a most *remarkable Testimony* in the case. But how Mr. *D.* will clear himself from disingenuity in the case, when he so cries up *Tilenus*, and his *Testimony* as being for them, and yet conceals, what he could not but know, that he is one of the most positive and clear witnesses for us that ever writ, I leave it to himself to consider. The words cited by Mr. *D. viz.* the six first lines, ending with [*washed in water*] are in his *4th. Thesis*: and signifie nothing on either side; and therefore might as well have been spa-

red.

red. But how came he to skip over the Second *Theſis*? where that Learned man plainly ſaith, *Baptiſm, if you conſider the Etymology of the word: ſignifies dipping, and alſo ſprinkling: in which ſenſe it is uſed* Mark 7. 4. *and from the conſequence a waſhing, ſuch as the old Law preſcribed many of: which alſo even in this part the Phariſees augmented with their own gekings.* It was not for the turn it ſhould be known, ſo learned a Proteſtant Writer ſaid thus much for the ſide, againſt which his name, authority, and teſtimony was to be produced: and therefore it was warily paſſed over.

Baptiſmus, ſi Etymon vocis ſpectemus, immerſionem ſignificat atque etiam aſperſionem. quo ſenſu uſurpatur Mar 7. 4. *& à conſequenti, ablutionem; cujuſmodi non paucas præcipiebat lex vetus, quam deinde etiam hac in parte auctariis ſuis cumularunt Phariſæi.* Tilen.

§. 50. But to go on with Mr. *D.* from the Fourth *Theſis* he skips to the Fifteenth, without ordering his Teſtimony any otherwiſe than ſo, as if the whole of what *Tilenus* ſaid, had been one continued ſpeech: and without taking notice of what he might have obſerved by the way in the Twelfth *Theſis*, that ſpeaking of the action and external Rites belonging to the external part of Baptiſm, he names them *dipping* or *ſprinkling*, with an addition of words, and appearing out of the water. And what ſaith *Tilenus* there? Much-what as Mr. *D.* reports from him. *Ritus in baptiſmo eſt triplex: immerſio in aquam, mora ſub aquâ, & emerſio ex aquâ. i. e.* as Mr. *D.* Engliſheth it, the outward Rite in Baptiſm is Threefold, (1.) Immerſion into the Water, (2.) Abiding under the water, (3.) Reſurrection out of the water. But is this all that the Learned man there ſaith? All I ſuppoſe, Mr. *D.* was willing ſhould be known was there. But to do the Author right, and to preſerve the Reader from being impoſed upon by a lame quotation, I will add the reſt of that Theſis: in which the words im-

— quò pertinent etiam reliquæ actiones & ritus externi, puta immerſio, vel aſperſio, cum adjectione verborum, & emerſio ex aqua. Id. ib. Theſ. 15.

mediately following to thoſe quoted by Mr. *D.* are theſe,

'* But though dipping were formerly more uſual, eſpecially in *Judæa*, and other hotter Countries, than Sprinkling; yet ſeeing neither this circumſtance doth pertain to the *ſubſtance* of baptiſm; and that the Analogy of the Sacrament is kept no leſs in ſprinkling than in dipping; ſince even in the legal purifications ſprinklings did ſuffice; finally ſeeing that dipping, eſpecially in tender Infants, ſuch as are moſt that now adays are baptized, is not without danger of health: we think, that as each Rite is ſignified by the word baptiſm (in *Matth.* 3. 16. *Luk.* 11. 38. *Mar.* 7. 4.) ſo by the Law of Charity and neceſſity the uſe of either of them may be retained by the Church.

* *Quamvis autem immerſio uſitatior olim fuerit, præſertim in Judæa, & aliis regionibus calidioribus quam aſperſio: tamen cum neque ad baptiſmi ſubſtantiam pertineat hæc circumſtantia; nec minus in aſperſione quam in immerſione Sacramenti analogia ſervetur: ſiquidem etiam in legalibus purificationibus ſufficiebant ραντισμοὶ· cum denique immerſio, præſertim in tenellis infantibus, qualesbodie ſunt plerique qui baptizantur, non careat valetudinis periculo: nos quemadmodum utrque ritus voce baptiſmi ſignificatur*, Matth. 3. 16. Luc. 11. 38. Marc. 7. 4. *ſic utriuſlibet uſum, ex charitatis & neceſſitatis lege ab Eccleſia retineri poſſe exiſtimamus. Id. ib.*

§. 52. This is indeed a moſt remarkable Teſtimony in the caſe. And I thank Mr. *D.* for it: which probably elſe I ſhould not have enquired after. But why Mr. *D.* concealed thus much of it from us, when he gave us the reſt, himſelf can better declare, than I divine. In the mean time the Reader may be pleaſed to take notice of theſe remarks in it. (1.) That the Etymology of the word ſignifies *dipping* and alſo *ſprinkling*. (2.) That he ſaith, that dipping was formerly *more* uſual than ſprinkling; but *not* that it *only* was uſual. (3.) That this circumſtance doth not pertain to the *ſubſtance* of baptiſm. (4.) That the *Analogie* of the Sacrament is kept no leſs in ſprinkling, than in dipping. (5.) That each Rite is ſignified by the word, in *Mat.* 16. *&c.*

(6.) That

(6.) That by the Law of charity and neceſſity the uſe of either of them (and then ſprinkling as well as dipping) may be retained in the Church. A remarkable Teſtimony indeed, this, eſpecially from an Author quoted againſt us by an Anabaptiſt.

§. 53. After this Mr. *D.* claps two *Theſes* more (*viz.* the 32. and 34.) to the reſt, ſo ſtill, as if all had been one continued diſcourſe, and as if that learned Writer had made one long continued harangue of dipping in Baptiſm, and ſpoken nothing between of any thing elſe. But becauſe what follows, conſiſts only in a fair declaration of the Analogy between dipping into water, continuing under it, and coming up again out of it, and things ſaid by him to be ſignified by thoſe actions, which are no matter of controverſie between us and the Anabaptiſts: therefore I forbear to tranſcribe any further: but leave the Reader to make his eſtimate of this Teſtimony, and of the Quoter of it.

§. 54. Mr. *Leigh* was a *Commentator*, as well as a *Critical* Writer, and upon that account he is brought in by the *Major* in this Squadron alſo, and charging us thus, Mr. *Leigh* in his *Annotat.* upon *Rom.* 6. 4. [*Buried with him in Baptiſm unto death.*] 'Baptiſm, *ſaith he*, is an Inſtru-'ment not only of thy death with Chriſt, which is the kil-'ling of ſin, but alſo of thy Burial with him, which is a 'perpetual mortification, or abiding under that death. 'He alludes to the manner in which Baptiſm was then admi-'niſtred, which was to plunge them in the water; the 'plunging of them into water, which were baptized, was 'a ſign of their death and Burial with Chriſt. So Mr. *D.* reports him.

§. 55. His words are, He alludes to the manner in which baptiſm was then adminiſtred, which was to ſtrip them naked whom they baptized, and plunge them in the water; after which they put on new garments: whence thoſe manners of ſpeaking uſed in Scripture, to *put on Chriſt*, *to put off the old man*, and *put on the new*, *Gal.* 3. 27. *Eph.* 4. 12, 13. *Coloſſ.* 2. 11. and 3. 9, 10. And he addes in the Margin, the

plunging of them into the water which were baptized, was a sign of their death, and burial with Christ.

§. 56. To this I answer, First, it is not to be doubted, but that putting wholly under the water was one manner of baptizing then used. But if in calling it *the manner*, it be meant, it was *the only manner*, this is easilier said, than proved; and better proof must be given of it, than hath yet appeared, before it be consented unto. Not Mr. *Leigh*'s bare word, though a very worthy and learned Person he were, hath authority enough for that, whilest there are so many, and strong presumptions of the contrary.

§. 57. Secondly, though in that place, and at that time, and by that Apostle, Baptism by a total dipping were the only baptism that were used, yet who can say, but that at another time, and in another place, and by the same, or some other Apostle, there was a baptizing by sprinkling, pouring on of water, or partial mersation? We have these other ways of baptizing in the Church; and in the Church they have anciently been had; and their original cannot be shewn; and therefore we have reason to believe them to have been from the beginning; though as being not the general way, which acknowledgedly was dipping, and as being administred but in cases of necessity, there appear not so many, nor so bright instances of them; and it is some matter of difficulty to trace them particularly up so high.

§ 58. Thirdly, I wonder Mr. *D.* did not as well mention their *stripping* too, as their *dipping*. If I might guess, it should be this, that he was loth it should be known, that the present practice of the Dippers were in any thing different from the Primitive. But that it most apparently is. For in the Primitive times they were dipped *naked*, as this Author of Mr. *Danvers*'s doth declare: but, as far as I understand, those whom our Dippers now baptize, are not naked when dipped, but have some Garment on. And this to avoid indecency. Now if in one thing, to avoid indecency,

cency, they may vary from the Primitive practice (whereto the manner of baptizing among the *Jews* also contributes its obligations) Why may not we, for the same end, vary from it in another? I shall not need to add, that anciently the baptized did put on *new Garments* after their baptizing, as Mr. *Leigh* saith, and for the reasons mentioned by Mr. *Leigh*. But I hear nothing of that practice among the Dippers: nor any thing but that the same Garments, which they did put off before their baptizing, they do put on again after their baptism. Which is another difference in theirs, from the Primitive way. And since the Primitive Saints did wholly strip themselves, to signifie that they did wholly put off the old Man, as concerning their former conversation; they should be afraid lest their not stripping themselves wholly, should signifie, that they did put off the old Man not wholly, but in part; and their putting on again the same Clothes they had on before, should signifie their being wholly the same that they were before. Those that stand so nicely upon it to be in all punctilio's of Rites conform to the Apostolick and Primitive practice, should, methinks, think of these things: for others, that are not so scrupulous about them, there is not the like necessity of observation of them.

Lastly, The *Assembly Divines*, who bring up the Rere of this Squadron of *Commentators*, do (as Mr. *D.* tells us) in their Annotations upon the place, say, 'That in this 'phrase the Apostle seems to allude to the ancient manner 'of baptizing, which was to dip the Parties unbaptized, 'and as it were to bury them under water for a while, and 'then to raise them up again out of it, to represent the bu'rial of the old Man, and our Resurrection to Newness 'of Life. The like saith *Piscator*, and *Diodate* upon the place.

§. 59. Mr. *Danvers* here fairly reports them; only in stead of those words [*to raise them up again*] the *Divines* have [to *draw them out of it*, and *lift them up*,] which change why he made I cannot discern: unless it were this;

That

That he feared those words [*to draw out, and lift up*] should import, that the Persons then baptized were such as were capable of being so *drawn* and *lifted*; and so make the Reader think that *Infants*, the propereſt persons for such actions to be done to (it being no easie thing to imagine how they could be performed to persons that were Adult; nor did I ever, to my remembrance, in any ancient Author read of any such action done to them) *were then baptized:* and then this testimony would do as much hurt to his cause one way, whilst it proved *Infants Baptism* as old as the Epistle to the *Romans*, as it did it good another way, whileſt it asserted their Baptism to have been by dipping. And perhaps he feared too, that the *lifting up* might make some think, that the use of *God-fathers* (the things so horribly decried by the Men of his way) was Primitive too: that work [*levare de fonte*] to lift up out of, or from the Font, being so proper to the God-fathers, as that it is made the common Phrase to import ones being a God-father. Thus much to him.

§. 60. Now to his *Authors*, I say the same that I said to Mr. *Leigh*, that if by those words [*the ancient manner*] they meant only, that it was *a way*, or *one manner*, and that the most *general way* and manner so to baptize, I shall grant it. But if they mean, that it was *the only way, and manner*, then their word signifies no more with me, than the ground, which they give for it, amounts unto, which is none at all. Now that being none, their word is nothing.

§. 61. And the same I say to *Piscator* and *Diodate*, if they so say, as the Assembly Divines have said. Though I rather think it was the *Assembly Divines*, that said the like to them, than they to the Assembly Divines, as being and writing before them. But however it were, to the same, or the like Argument, the same, or the like Answer is to be returned.

§. 62. And thus I have also cleared the Field of this Squadron of *Commentators*. The third and last, which consists

sists of a mixed multitude of Writers, *Historical*, *Didactical*, *Polemical*, *Scholastical*, and *Casuistical*, comes up so close to and near with this, that I cannot defer the encounter, but must instantly cope with them.

CHAP. XIII.

Answers to more Authorities produced by Mr. Danvers, *from Historians, Casuists, and other* Polemical, *as well as* Didactical *Writers.*

§. 1. DOctor *Cave* (whom Mr. *D.* truly calls a *great Searcher into Antiquity*; and who, I truly believe, has digested more of that, than many others have read) leads up the last Squadron. 'And he (as Mr. *D.* tells 'us) in his late Book called *Primitive Christianity*, saith, '*p.* 320. That the Party baptized was wholly immerged, 'or put under water; which was the almost constant and 'universal custom of those times, whereby they did most 'notably and significantly express the great End and Effects 'of Baptism; for, as in immerging, there are in a manner, 'three several acts, the putting the Person into water, his 'abiding there for some time, and his rising up again; 'thereby representing Christ's Death, Burial, and Resur-'rection; and in conformity thereto, our dying unto sin, 'the destruction of its power, and our Resurrection to a 'new course of life. By the Persons being put into water, 'was lively represented the putting off the body of the sins 'of the Flesh, and being washed from the filth and pollu-'tion of them. By his being under it, which is a kind of 'Burial into water, his entring into a state of Death or 'Mortification; like as Christ remained for some time un-'der the state or power of Death; therefore it is said, As 'many as are baptized into Christ, are baptized into his 'Death,

'Death, *&c.* And then by his emersion or rising up out 'of the water, is signified his entring upon the new course 'of life, that like as Christ was raised from the Dead by 'the Glory of the Father, so we should walk in newness of 'life. Thus Mr. *D.* reports him.

§. 2. But for all this, (1.) that Doctor is no *Anabaptist*; nor against *Sprinkling* in Baptism. For he doth not say that immerging was absolutely the constant, and universal custom of those times, but, with a restriction, *almost* the constant, and universal custom: that is, it was not the constant, nor the universal custome, but yet very much in use, the common practice of those times, as he after explains himself, *p.* 321. Which is a clear confession of some other way of baptizing then in use, besides immerging, though not so much in use as that.

§. 3. Secondly, after the Doctor's discourse of the signification of the Persons being put under, and being under the water, and rising up out of it, (which is all that Mr. *D.* takes notice of, and stops, when he comes at the end of it) the Doctor goes on to speak of *Sprinkling*: and saith,—But though by reason of the more eminent signification of these things, immersion was the common practice in those days, and therefore they earnestly urged it, and pleaded for it, yet did they not hold sprinkling to be *unlawful*; especially in cases of necessity, of weakness, danger of death, or where conveniency of immerging could not be had; in these and such like cases *Cyprian* does not only allow, but plead for it, and that in a discourse on purpose, when the question concerning it was put to him. Upon *this account* it is, that immersion is generally disused in these parts of the World, and sprinkling succeeded in its room, because the tender bodies of most Infants (the only Persons now baptized) could not be put under water in the cold Northern Climats, without apparent prejudice to their health, if not their lives: and therefore in this, as in other cases, God requires *mercy* rather

Ep. 76. ad Magn. p. 153.

rather than Sacrifice, eſpecially conſidering, that the main ends of Baptiſm are attained this way, and the Myſtical effects of it as truly, though not ſo plainly and ſignificantly repreſented by Sprinkling, as by putting the body under water.

§. 4. In which diſcourſe of his theſe remarks are ſo obvious, that 'tis loſs, I fear, of time, to take notice of them to the Reader. (1.) That the practice of dipping, was *but almoſt*, and was *not abſolutely* univerſal in the Primitive times. (2.) That *ſprinkling* was *not* then held *unlawful*. (3.) That Sprinkling was eſpecially allowed in caſes of *neceſſity*, *weakneſs*, *danger of death*, or *want of conveniency* for immerging. (4.) That in this caſe God requires mercy, rather than Sacrifice. (5.) That the *main ends* of baptiſm are this way obtained. (6.) That the Myſtical effects of it are as truly repreſented this way, as by dipping, though not ſo plainly. So grave a witneſs was Dr. *Cave* againſt Sprinkling in Baptiſm.

§. 5. Biſhop *Jewel* is the next that Mr. *Danvers* makes to appear in this cauſe. And he (as Mr. *D.* tells us) in his *Apologie*, p. 308. 'brings the *Council of Wormes* deter-'mining the manner of Baptiſm thus, *viz.* That the dipping 'into the water is the going down into Hell (or the Grave) 'and that the coming out of the water is the Reſurrection.

§. 6. But B. *Jewel* hath nothing of this in his *Apology*, which I read all over, to find it. Miſſing it there, I ſought for it in *Caranzas Epitome* of the Councils: but that hath nothing of it neither. Then I ſearched the *Councils at large* in *Surius*, and there I found what that Council ſaid in reference to this matter; as alſo at laſt in B. *Jewels Defenſe* of his Apology, part. 2. pag. not 308, but yet 309 And it is plain to every man, that has but a drachm of brains in his Skull, that the Council there doth not *determine the manner* of Baptiſm, as Mr. *D.* would make the *B.* ſay it doth, but only *declareth the meaning* of that way of Baptizing, when perſons are dipped, namely that going into the water repreſents going down into a grave, or a burial, and that

that coming out of the water represents a coming out of the grave, or a resurrection. The words of the Council as they are in *Surius*, are these, *Et ne fortè cuiquam sit dubium hujus simplex mysterium Sacramenti, videat in eo mortem & resurrectionem Christi significari. Nam in aquis mersio, quasi in infernum descensio est; & rursum ab aquis emersio, resurrectio est.* Therefore (so B. *Jewel* reports part of them) in the *Council of Wormes* it is written thus, *In aquas demersio, in Infernum descensio est; & rursus ab aquis emersio, resurrectio est*: The dipping into the water is the going into hell; and the coming out from the water is the Resurrection. So no *determination* here of the *manner* of Baptism to be by dipping, but only a *declaration* of the *meaning* of that Ceremony, when the person baptized is dipped.

Formaticense Concil. Can. 5. de Baptismi Sacramento, ap. Surium, *Tom. 3. p. 522.*

§. 7. Now to requite Mr. *D.* for his Quotation out of B. *Jewel*, I will, before I part, give him one out of that his Author also, telling him, that Bishop declares the Church of *Englands* belief of *Baptism to be a Sacrament*, not of immersion, or dipping, which is but the Secondary consideration in that Sacrament, *but of that*, which is primary and principal in it, namely, that *ablution or washing which we have in*, [or *by*] *the blood of Christ*: and also that she believeth, not only that none who are willing to profess the name of Christ, but *no Infants of Christian Parents*, in regard they are born in sin, and belong to the people of God, *are to be kept from it.*

Et [*credimus*] *baptismum quidem Sacramentum esse remissionis peccatorum, & ejus ablutionis, quam habemus in Christi sanguine: & ab eo neminem qui velit profiteri nomen Christi, ne infantes quidem Christianorum hominum, quoniam nascuntur in peccato, & pertinent ad populum dei, arcendos esse.* Juelli Apol. *p. 38. edit. Londin. 1581.*

§. 8. Next to B. *Jewel* succeeds Mr. *Baxter*, 'And (saith 'Mr. *D.*) most remarkable is the Testimony Mr. *Baxter* 'himself

'himſelf gives to this Truth, wherein he alſo owns the 'changing of the Ceremony in his third Argument againſt 'Mr. *Blake* in theſe words, *viz.*

'§. 9. *Quoad modum*, To the manner, ſaith he, it is com-'monly confeſſed by us to the Anabaptiſts (as our *Commen-'tators* declare) that in the Apoſtles time the Baptized 'were dipped over head in water; and that this ſignifieth 'their profeſſion both of believing the Burial and Reſur-'rection of Chriſt, and of their own preſent renouncing 'the world, and fleſh, or dying to ſin, and living to Chriſt, 'or riſing again to newneſs of life, or being buried and 'riſen again with Chriſt, as the Apoſtle expoundeth in the 'forecited Texts of *Coloſſ.* 2. and *Rom.* 6. And though '(ſaith he) we have thought it lawful to diſuſe the man-'ner of dipping, and to uſe leſs water; yet we preſume not 'to change the uſe and ſignification of it. So then he that 'ſignally profeſſeth to die, and riſe again in Baptiſm with 'Chriſt, doth ſignally profeſs ſaving Faith, and Repen-'tance; but this do all they that are baptized according to 'the Apoſtles practice.

§. 10. I anſwer, that I ſee nothing in this Teſtimony that merits ſo triumphant a Remark to be ſet upon it, for any advantage that is given to Mr. *Danvers* Cauſe by it. Mr. *Baxter* confeſſeth that in the Apoſtles time the baptized were dipped over *head* in water, But he doth not confeſs that they were dipped over *Body* too. Plainly, that which Mr. *Baxter* confeſſeth amounts but to a partial merſation of the *head*, and doth not neceſſarily imply a total immerſion of the *Body*; unleſs it were impoſſible for a man to have his *head* dipped in water, except his whole *body* were dipped into it alſo. And if that will do Mr. *D.* any ſervice, much good d'it him with his Teſtimony. The like we have ſhewn in theſe Papers from St. *Auguſtin*, and St. *Hierom*, *&c.* But that will not do the Dippers buſineſs; whom nothing will ſerve, but a total Judaical immerſion of the whole Body. And the change Mr. *Baxter* ſpeaks of I ſuppoſe to be from this partial dipping, into ſprinkling, which granted ſignifies nothing.

§. 11. But

§. 11. But suppose he meant, what he said, of a total immersion, then I judge his sense was, that generally the baptized were in the Apostles time dipped over head in water, not *universally*; that *most* were *so* baptized, not that *none* were baptized *otherwise*. And then his Confession will neither hurt himself nor us.

§. 12. But if he meant more than so, then since he hath at the same time declared himself to have thought it lawful to disuse the, *i. e.* that manner of Dipping, and to use less water, it is plain he thought the Church not to be obliged by that Apostolical practice to an universal observance thereof through all successions of Ages, but to have power to make alteration even in Sacramentals, so they were but Circumstantial, and not Essential parts of Worship. And so the producing of his Testimony seems to be but a wresting of his words to signifie what was not in his mind: which whether it be fair or no, I leave to Mr. *D.* himself to consider.

§. 13. If I have not spoken Mr. *Baxter's* mind, or have not spoken it unto his mind, he is alive, of age, and ability to answer for himself. And I rather wish he would be pleased to do it himself, who can do it infinitely better, than I dare presume my self able to do.

§. 14. The next that we are to encounter, is *Daillé*, on the Fathers, who (as Mr. *D.* tells us) *l.* 2. *p.* 148. saith, 'That it was a Custom heretofore in the Ancient Church, 'to plunge those they baptized, over Head and Ears in the 'Water; as, *saith he*, *Tertullian* (in 'his Third Book, *De Cor. Mil.*) *Cy-* 'prian, (in his seventh *Ep. p.* 211.) '*Epiphanius*, *Pan.* (30. *p.* 128.) and 'others testifie. And this, saith he, 'is still the practice both of the *Greek* 'and *Russian* Church at this day; as 'Cassander *De Bapt.* (*p.* 193.) And 'yet, saith he, notwithstanding, this 'Custom, which is both so ancient, 'and

There is some little mistake in these quotations, which may be rectified by Mr. *Daille's* Margent thus. *Tertul. l. de Cor. Mil. c.* 3. Cyprian. *Ep.* 76. *p.* 211. *Edit. Pamel.* Epiphan. *Pan. Hær.* 30. *p.* 128. Cassand. *l. de Bapt. Inf. p.* 693.

'and so universal, is now abolished by the Church of *Rome*; 'and this is the reason (saith he) that the *Muscovites* say, 'that the *Latines* are not rightly and duly baptized, be-'cause they are not wont to use this Ancient Ceremony in 'their Baptism.

§. 15. Either Mr. *D.* misunderstands Mr. *Daille*: or Mr. *Daille* mistook the matter? Possibly both may be true. First, Mr. *D.* might misunderstand *Daille*. For he might think *Daille* meant, that Dipping was the *only* custom in the Ancient Church. But *Daille* doth not say so. He only saith it was *a custom*, but he doth not say it was *the only* custom. And 'tis true: *a custom* it was so to baptize healthy Persons; but it was not *the* custom so to baptize all Persons, for *Clinicks* were baptized in their Beds. Now for Mr. *D.* from an expression of *a custom*, that is, one custome, to conclude for *the* custom, that is, the only custom, is, as I humbly conceive, a misunderstanding.

§. 16. But secondly, if that were Mr. *Daille*'s meaning, as it may seem probable by his after words, when he saith,--- *this custom which is both so ancient, and so universal, is now abolished* — then, yet under correction, I say, that great Man herein shewed himself to be but Man, and liable, like other inferiour mortals, to mistake. For though the custom was so *ancient* as to reach up to the Primitive times, yet it was not so *universal* as to extend to all Persons in all, either of the ancient, or later times, as, I think, I have invincibly demonstrated in these Papers. And perhaps the consideration hereof was the reason why that great Man did not speak positively in the case, and say absolutely, that it was *the Universal* custom of *the Ancient* Church, but in a modified strain, *so ancient*, and *so universal*, *i. e.* so ancient as to have been in the Primitive, and so universal as still to be in the *Greek* and *Russian* Church. A great piece of matter.

§. 17. But after all this, it may not be amiss to make some few further Remarks on this Quotation. As First, that Mr. *Danvers* leaves out after these words [*and others*

teſtifie] theſe which follow, [*And indeed they plunged them thus three times: as the ſame* Tertullian *and St.* Hierom *both inform us*] But why left he out this paſſage? Let the Reader judge. He eſpied in Mr. *Daille*'s Margent, where St. *Hierom*'s teſtimony was referred to, theſe words at length, and not in figures, [*In lavacro ter caput mergitare*] by which it is plain, that this plunging *over head and ears*, at leaſt as far as St. *Hierom* gives teſtimony to it, was but of the *whole Head*, and not of the *whole Body*. Now that, had it been put in, would have ſpoiled all. For that would have proved but a partial merſation: and then it would have been no proof of a total immerſion; and ſo have ſignified nothing to the purpoſe, that by Mr. *Danvers* it was quoted for.

§. 18. Secondly, whereas Mr. *Daille* ſaith, that this is ſtill the practice both of the *Greek*, and of the *Ruſſian* Church, even at this very day, I am not ſo well skilled in the preſent Rites of thoſe Churches, as peremptorily to contradict him. Yet that it hath been univerſally the practice of both thoſe Churches from the firſt to this day to baptize at all times by a total immerſion, I cannot conſent unto it. And that the *Ruſſian* Church at leaſt hath formerly, if it do not at this day baptize by pouring of water on the baptized, I have ſhewed in theſe Papers. *Ch.* 10.

§. 19. Thirdly, after thoſe words, wherewith Mr. *Danvers* concludes, [*in their baptiſm*] Mr. *Daille* adds [*which, they ſay, is expreſly injoyned them in the Canons of Joannes Metropolitanus, whom they hold to have been a Prophet.*] But why did not Mr. *Danvers* add this? The Reader may eaſily conjecture the reaſon of it: even becauſe the *Muſcovites* did ground their cuſtom, for non-obſervance whereof they ſay that the *Latines* are not rightly and duly baptized, not on the Word of God, but on the Canons of a Man, one *Joannes Metropolitanus*. Now to make it a Humane Inſtitution, or the Inſtitution of a Man, of whoſe Divine Inſpiration, and to ſuch purpoſe too as to give

Laws

Laws to the Church in the name of God, we have no infallible aſſurance, would not do the Total Dippers buſineſs, who urge the univerſal obſervation of their Baptiſmal Rite, on no leſs an Authority, than that of a Divine command: and ſo Mr. *D.* wiſely let it alone. But others may obſerve it, and make of it what uſe they can.

§. 20. Fourthly, whereas Mr. *Daille*, and from him Mr. *Danvers* ſaith, this is the reaſon that the *Muſcovites* ſay, that the *Latines* are not rightly and duly baptized, becauſe they are not wont to uſe this ancient Ceremony; it may be noted, that the *Muſcovites* (even taken according to what is here ſaid of them) do not charge the *Latines* with not being baptized at all, but with not being *rightly*, and *duly* baptized. This then is as clear an intimation of their allowing of the Baptiſm of the *Latines*, for ſubſtance, and granting that it is a Baptiſm, as it is of their diſallowing of it for circumſtance, and denying it to be rightly and duly performed. For he that ſays a Man is not rightly baptized, grants him baptized, whilſt he denies his baptiſm to have been rightly adminiſtred. For there can be no right or wrong, no due or undue baptiſm, where there is no baptizing at all. *Sublato ſubjecto tollitur proprietas.* And ſo this part of the Teſtimony clearly deſtroys that which it was produced to prove: and makes the *Muſcovites* witneſs to the truth of a Baptiſm amongſt the *Latines*: whereas the contrary was deſigned by their Teſtimony, which I wonder Mr. *Danvers* did not ſee, and conſider, and for the ſake thereof paſs that by.

§. 21. Laſtly, whereas Mr. *Daille* ſaith, this cuſtom is now aboliſhed by the Church of *Rome*; I ask what he means by *Aboliſhing*. If he ſay, the *ceſſation* of it by vertue of any Canonical Decree of that Church, then I ſhall require the *Council*, and *Canon*, by which its abolition was decreed; and be of opinion, till I ſee the contrary, that none ſuch will be produced. If by *Aboliſhing* he mean *Diſuſing*, then I grant, that in that ſenſe this cuſtom was indeed then aboliſhed, when that Author writ. But I muſt

say withal that it was not then first abolished, but long before: and that the beginning of such its abolition is like the head of *Nilus*, undiscoverable: the custom growing by insensible degrees from being at first almost universal, to become at last almost quite out of use, if yet at all it be used in that Church. So little grist is by this Testimony brought to the Anabaptists mill.

§. 22. From him Mr. *D.* proceeds to *Walafridus Strabo*, who *De Reb. Eccles.* tells us, 'That we must know, 'that the first Believers were baptized simply in Flouds and 'Fountains.

§. 23. Well, admit this: it follows not, First, that all that were baptized in flouds and fountains, were totally immersed into them: they might be but *sprinkled*, or but *partially dipped* in floud or fountain.

§. 24. Secondly, it follows not hence, that if *any* Believers were totally immersed, *all* were so. The expression is but *Indefinite*, and not *Universal*: and it is true, if but some Believers were so baptized. But that all Believers were so baptized, as he doth not say, so it is, if he had said it, without convincing evidence to prove its truth.

§. 25. Nay Thirdly, that he did mean his words but *Indefinitely* and not *Universally*, is plain by his own words that follow (which Mr. *D.* thought it not for his interest to discover) It is (saith he) to be noted, that many have been baptized not only by dipping, but also by pouring water from above upon them (and he had given before an instance in *Lucillus* baptized by St. *Laurence* that way) and that they may still be so baptized; adding also an account on which it was usual to baptize otherwise than by dipping; even when the Fonts were too little to contain the greater bodies.

Notandum, non solùm mergendo, sed etiam desuper fundendo multos baptizatos fuisse, & adhuc posse baptizari, &c. Hoc autem solet evenire cùm provectiorum granditas corporum in minoribus vasibus hominem tingi non patitur. Walafrib. Strabo *de Reb. Eccles. c.* 26.

§. 26. His

§. 26. His next Author is Mr. *Fox*; and he (as Mr. *D.* ſaith) tells us in his *Acts* and *Monuments*, *part.* 1. *pag.* 138. out of *Fabian*, *c.* 119, 120. 'That *Auſtin* and *Paulinus* 'did in the Seventh Century, baptize here in *England* great 'multitudes in the River *Trent*, and the River *Swol*: where 'note by the way, ſaith Mr. *Fox*, it followed, there 'was no uſe of Fonts. The like alſo, as you'l here-'after find, *Germanus* and *Lupus*, the two *French* Evange-'liſts, did in the Fifth Century, baptize multitudes in the 'River *Allin* near *Cheſter*.

§. 27. Grant all this, and what then? Then it follows, that 'tis probable that ſome were baptized in *England* in two ſeveral Centuries, by immerſion: becauſe many were baptized in *Rivers*. Yet I ſay 'tis but probable, not certain; unleſs appearing from other evidence: becauſe a man may be baptized in a River, without being totally immerſed into it. And in that multitudes are ſaid to have been baptized in thoſe Rivers, it makes it the more probable, that the baptiſm was not by a total immerſion; becauſe the labour and time was more in baptizing ſo, than otherwiſe; and when the Baptizer was but one, or but a few; and the Perſons to be baptized many, reaſon would prompt, that the more compendious and leſs troubleſome way ſhould be taken; and that was ſprinkling, pouring on of water, or partial merſation into it.

§. 28. And if there were no Fonts, as Mr. *Fox* notes, then there was the more reaſon they ſhould go to Rivers. Though their going to Rivers does not prove there were no Fonts. For where many were to be baptized, Fonts, unleſs of large capacity, were not ſo convenient as Rivers, where many Miniſters at once might be doing the work, whereas at a Font hardly any more baptized than one at once. But, be that as it will, doth this prove, that none either in *England*, or in any other country, either in thoſe, or any other Ages, were baptized by ſprinkling, or any other way than by a total dipping? It is impoſſible it ſhould, eſpecially when the contrary to it is evidenced by Fact, as

I have made appear in these Papers, *ch.* 10. This then only follows hence, that this whole passage is a grand impertinence, and proves nothing of what is disputed of in this question: which is not, whether any, or what number, were baptized by dipping; but whether never any in the Church were baptized by Sprinkling, or other way than by a total immersion.

§. 29. Having written thus much on supposition of integrity in the quotation, I resolved to consult the Author himself. And though not according to the quotation made by Mr. *D.* of *Part* 1. *p.* 138, *&c.* yet in *pag.* 107. *col.* 2. *l.* 70, *&c.* I found this which follows. But to return to *Austin* again, who by report of Authors was departed before this cruelty was done, after he had baptized and Christened ten thousand *Saxons* or *Angles* in the West river, that is called *Swale*, beside *York*, on Christmas-day, perceiving his end to draw near, he ordained a Successor named *Laurentius*, to rule after him the Archbishops See of *Dorobernia*. Where note by the way (Christian Reader) that whereas *Austin* baptized then in Rivers; it followeth there was then no use of Fonts. Again if it be true that *Fabian* saith, he baptized Ten thousand in one day: the rite then of baptizing at *Rome* was not so Ceremonial, neither had so many Trinkets at that time, as it hath since: or else it could not be that he could baptize so many on one day.

Upon this Relation I shall crave the Readers leave to make some remarks.

§. 30. And first, supposing *Augustine* to have been a man of great strength, and then at the fulness of it, yet the number of the Persons said to be baptized by him, and all in one day, (*viz.* 10000.) is so great, as that it exceeds all measures of credibility, that so many could be baptized of him by a total dipping of them. When we read of but *Three thousand* baptized in one day by twelve persons, wise and learned men think it reasonable, from the difficulty, if not impossibility of it, that so many should by a total immersion

merſion be baptized by ſo few in ſo ſhort a time, to conclude, that there baptizing was performed, not by dipping, but by ſprinkling. Now much more ſtrongly is the ſame to be argued, when againſt three thouſand to twelve, is ſet Ten thouſand to one.

§. 31. But then Secondly, if we conſider the time of his Life, when this was done, the improbability, or rather impoſſibility of it will ſtill the more appear. It was when his ſtrength was gone, when he was an old man, and near his death. For the very next thing, that our Author mentions of him, after his performance of this great baptiſm, is his perceiving his end to draw near. Had he had the ſtrength of *Samſon*, ſuch a days work as the total dipping of Ten thouſand men had been enough to have tired him to the death. How much more unable was an old man with one foot in his grave to go through ſuch a ſervice! And if it be argued from the inability of all the Miniſters of a whole City to baptize by dipping, but ſo many as came to be baptized at the mother Church, only on one of the three ſolemn times of the year, that (becauſe the greatneſs of the work of lifting of ſo many into and out of the Fonts exceeded the ſtrength of the Baptizers) therefore they baptized by Sprinkling: how much more may it be argued from the inſufficiency of one old, and conſequently a weak man, for the total immerſion of ſo many as Ten thouſand at once, that he did it not by dipping, but by ſprinkling?

§. 32. And yet Thirdly, if we conſider the time of the year, when this is ſaid to be done, it will ſtill render it more improbable, or rather impoſſible. It was on no other than *Chriſtmaſs-day*, anciently called *Midwinter-day*. It cannot, I think, be well imagined how one man ſhould totally dip another in a River, who is not himſelf in the ſame River with him. Nor is any thing ſuggeſted to the contrary in all the Antiquities I have converſed with, ſo far as I can call to remembrance. So then *Auguſtin* muſt be ſuppoſed in that ſtarving Seaſon to ſtand in the ſame River all the while that he was baptizing them. Now that an Old

man should be able to stand either naked, or clothed in a River, and on a *Christmas-day*, and till he had totally dipped Ten thousand men, is so far beyond all degrees of probability, that it can be concluded nothing less than impossible.

§ 33. Either then there was no such baptizing of such a multitude in a River (at that time especially) and then, why did Mr. *D.* urge that practice of *Augustines* upon us? or else it was done in a way that was more practicable: and then nothing can put in so fair a plea for it as sprinkling. Nay, Mr. *Fox* himself argues, that either there was less to do about Baptism in *Augustines* time, than in his own (his words are, that the Rite of it was not so Ceremonial, neither had so many Trinkets at that time, as it hath since,) or else it could not be, that he could baptize so many in one day.

§. 34. Now why Mr. *D.* would only tell us in general of *Augustines* baptizing great multitudes in Rivers, and not tell us of these particularities of his baptizing them, it is easie to conjecture; even because he saw he could not relate them, but that presently these, or some such like remarks would be made upon them, and so his quotation would either prove to be to no purpose, or else to be against his own purpose.

§. 35. And as for the storie of *Paulinus*, which is a different thing from that of *Augustines*, however jumbled together into one by Mr. *D.* it is plainly this, as it is related by Mr. *Fox*, *pag.* 109. *col.* 2. *lin.* 3. *&c.* that having first baptized King *Edwine* with many other of his subjects with him at *York*, he did from that time forth, during the life of *Edwine*, which was the term of six years more, continually Christen in the Rivers of *Gwenie*, and *Swala*, in both Provinces of *Deira*, and in *Berenicia*, using the said Rivers for Fonts.

§. 36. But first, it is not here said, that he dipped them in those Rivers. And if it had been so said, it had only proved positively that dipping was then in use, not negatively, that sprinkling was not. Secondly that Note, which Mr. *Fox* makes

makes concerning *Augustines* baptizing in Rivers, *viz.* that it was because there was then no use of Fonts, is not added also upon *Paulinus*'s baptizing in Rivers, though Mr. *Danvers* sets it after both, as belonging to both. Thirdly, River-dipping was not the only way of baptizing used by *Paulinus*. For neither King *Edwine* himself, nor those many subjects of his, that were baptized with him, were, by the Confession of Mr. *Fox*, baptized in any River. For he tells us in his Margin to that place, where he relates the story, that King *Edwine* was baptized in St. *Peters-Church* at *York*, which he caused first to be made of Wood (and that in order to his being baptized therein, as *Bede* informs us) which was after by St. *Oswald* builded of Stone. And if that baptizing was in the Church, then it could not be in the River, especially as the Church now stands, unless afterward weary of standing so low it took its progress and walked up the hill. And if it were in a Church, that the baptism was, then whether it were not in a Font; and whether not by sprinkling, or at most a partial mersation, since we have no remains, that I know, of any Fonts of capacity for a total immersion unless of Infants, it is free for the Reader to make his conjecture. And he that five hundred years hence should read the story of the baptism of the Turk converted by Dr. *Gunning*, and should see in the Churches then, no other Fonts, but such as we have in our Churches now, would never imagine that Baptism to have been by *dipping*, but would conclude, that it was by aspersion, or affusion, or at most by a partial mersation.

Bed. *Eccl. Hist.* l. 2. c. 14.

§. 37. As to what he saith concerning *Germanus* and *Lupus*, the two French Evangelists, *viz.* that they did in the Fifth Century baptize multitudes in the River *Allin* near *Chester*, which we shall find hereafter, I answer, first, that having neither told us where, nor when we should find it, we might well pass it over without further notice, till we should meet with it. But secondly, having a desire to know further,

further, what might be discovered of them, that concerned our present purpose, and not having time to read over all that remained behind in his book for it, I consulted his Index: but it should seem, what was said of them, was not worthy so great a remark as to be put in there. Notwithstanding, out of a desire to be satisfied, turning over the leaves of his book, I found in *pag.* 228. that those two famous French men being sent over into *Britain*, to help against the *Pelagian heresie*, were instrumental to convert many, and did baptize great multitudes upon confession of Faith in the River *Allin* near *Chester*. But still we are but where we were before. For 'tis only said here, that those two Evangelists did baptize many in the River *Allin*: and 'tis but the same man, *viz.* Mr. *D.* that saith it. But how they baptized there, whether by asperson, affusion, partial mersation, or total immersion, is not said, no not by Mr. *D.* himself. Yet thirdly, I examined several Chronicles, and Historians about it, *viz. Fox*, and *Holinshead*, *Marian. Scotus*; *Sigebert Gemblac. Fascic. Temp. Magdeburg. Cent. Vincent. Bellnacens. Spondan. Baronius*, and *Bedes History*: but not a word in them all appears, by which their total dipping in that River is necessarily concluded. Fourthly, then it must be concluded, that because it was in a River, that they were baptized, therefore at their baptism they were dipped. But that, as we have already shewed, is a weak inference; and grounded on no certain bottom. And if River-baptizing infer total immersing, then by the same consequence, or as good, Baptism out of a River infers Sprinkling, or some other way distinct from total dipping. And if that be good, then from *Bede*'s relation of the baptizing of a great multitude in a *Church* erected for that purpose, so far as I can gather from the circumstances of that History, against the day of our Lord's resurrection, as *Bede* words it, or *Easter* day, as (*Holinshead* interprets it) by the same *Germanus*, it may be concluded, that the

Bed. *Eccl. Hist. l.* 1. *c.* 20. *fol.* 23. *a.*
Holinsh. *Hist. of Eng. l.* 5. *c.* 6. *p.* 8. *a l.* 10. *&c.*

the ſaid *Germanus* did baptize a great multitude otherwiſe, than by dipping. And ſo his baptizing in *Allin*, though we ſuppoſe it to have been done there by dipping, is no prejudice to our cauſe. Let Mr. *D.* give us the one, or not ask of us the other. Though in truth neither way of arguing is demonſtrative, what probability ſoever may be ſuppoſed to be in either. But —

§. 38. *Hieremias Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* (his next Author) *ad Theol. Witebergenſes, Reſp.* 11. *c.* 4. ſaith, 'The Ancients baptized not by ſprinkling the baptized with 'water with their hands, but by immerſion, following 'the Evangeliſts who came up out of the water; therefore 'did he deſcend, which muſt needs be Immerſion, and not 'Aſperſion.

§. 39. The words, as thus tranſlated, are not in my apprehenſion reconcilable with good ſenſe. Therefore I will ſet down the original, as I find them in B. *Taylor. Baptizabant enim veteres, non manibus ſuis aquam baptizando aſpergentes, ſed trinâ immerſione, hoc Evangelii ſequentes, Aſcendit ex aquâ, ergo deſcenderat. Ecce immerſio, non aſperſio.* *Caſ. Conſc. p.* 644.

§. 40. Whom does he mean by the *Veteres*, the Ancients here? The Predeceſſors of Chriſtianity in any one Age, or more? And does he ſpeak of them univerſally, ſo as to mean, that in any one, or more of the firſt Ages, no one was baptized by ſprinkling, but all, without exception, by dipping, and that thrice? It will be long before his Patriarchſhip will be able to prove either the Affirmative or Negative part of his Propoſition.

§. 41. Firſt, to prove an Immerſion (meaning a total one) in the firſt Age is not very eaſie, much leſs a threefold one, by any witneſs that lived in that Age. By the Scripture I am ſure he cannot. For that ſpeaks indeed of baptizing into the name of *three perſons*, but not of *three dippings* at the three namings of thoſe Perſons: though I rationally believe it to have been ſo in the firſt Age, becauſe

I find it to have been so in the second, and yet find no original of it there.

§. 42. And secondly, to prove, that none were baptized by sprinkling, is more hard. For finding sprinkling in the after Ages, and finding no rise of it, when first it began, in any one of them, it is as supposable, that it also came from the first, as that the trine Immersion did. Which, as I noted, none of the first Age more speak to, than they do of sprinkling.

§. 43. But the Patriarch gives us their ground of that practice, the words of the Gospel, *Ascendit ex aquâ*, and thence he supposed, that they gathered, *ergo descenderat*, therefore he went down into it. And thereupon infers his Conclusion with an *Ecce* of Triumph, *Ecce immersio, non aspersio*, Behold an immersion, not an asperſion.

§. 44. But I think those Ancients lived nearer *Aristotles* time than he, and were better Logicians than to infer such a conclusion from such premisses. For first, the word in the original is ἀνέβη not ἐξ, but ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, he ascended, not out of, but from the water; now that he might do, that was not at all in it, but only by it, at the brink, or bank of it. *A going down to* the water they might gather, but not *a going down into* the water. And secondly, unless it had been impossible for any man to go into the water, without going so into it, as to be covered all over with it, neither his going into it, nor his coming out of it, can ever prove his total immersion in it. If from any Topic else it may be inferred, well, and good; but from this it can never be: as I have shewn in these Papers, *ch.* 10. where this matter is particularly, and at large debated on. So that there is no need to seek for shelter in the Patriarchs only gathering from hence an Immersion, and not expressing that Immersion to be a total one: less than which nothing will serve our Total Dippers: and therefore I shall pass on, and receive the charge of his next Author.

§. 45. And

§. 45. And as he tells us, *Zepperus* * *De Sacramentis*, from the Annotation and Etymology of the word (saith) 'it doth appear, what was 'of old the Custom of admini-'string Baptism, which though we 'have changed into Rhantizing or 'Sprinkling.

* *Si vocis notationem attendere velimus, vocabulum baptismi mersionem significat in aquam, vel ipsum mergendi & abluendi actum, ex ipsâ ergo vocis notatione & Etymologiâ apparet quæ baptismi administrandi consuetudo fuerit initio: cùm nos pro βαπτισμῷ ῥαντισμὸν potius, hoc est aspersionem nunc habeamus.* Zepper. *de Sacram. ap.* Leigh. *Crit. Sacra.*

§. 46. I suppose Mr. *D.* had this quotation from Mr. *Leigh*, in whom it is, but was loth any body should look for it there, for fear of what follows from *Danæus*, by whom we are told that (and told the reason too why) βαπτισμὸς is commonly in Scripture taken *pro lotione & mundatione*, for washing and cleansing.

§. 47. But be that as it will, the Testimony will not trouble us much to answer it. For if the Author meant, that *of old* it was *a custom* to administer Baptism by dipping, or *the more usual*, or *more general custom* so to administer it, we shall easily grant it. But if he meant, that it was the *only* custom of old so to administer it, I have given so sufficient evidence of other customs besides that, even of old, that we must, and with good reason enter our dissent from him.

§. 48. And whereas the Quoter saith, it was *of old* the Custom, the Authors word is *initio*, at first or in the beginning. Now it is to be suspected by his rendring that word *of old*, that he designed to put a slur upon us, as if that Author had intended to declare or intimate, that sprinkling was no custom of old, but a new practice come up but of late into the Church: whereas it pleads Antiquity for it self, and that so high, that none can find any original of it lower than the Primitive times. And so, though it might not have been a custom *initio*, at the very first, to baptize that way, but dipping may claim the priority of

it

it for that, yet it might very soon after the first beginning upon reasons thought well of by the Apostles, or Apostolical persons, come into practice, and so become a custom of old, though it were not a custom *initio*, in, or at the first beginning. *Deacons*, as distinct Officers from Apostles, were of old, in the Primitive times, even in the Apostles days: and yet they were not *initio*, at the first beginning of Christianity, or constitution of the Christian Church, but ordained some time after its beginning, and by the Apostles themselves, *Acts* 6. 5, 6.

§. 49. And whereas that Author saith, that we now rather have *pro βαπτισμῷ ῥαντισμὸν*, *i. e. Rhantism* instead of *Baptism*; I answer, that the word *βαπτισμὸς* is taken two ways: first, more *strictly*, for the *act* of immersion or dipping, or more *largely*, for the *Sacrament* of Baptism however administred. And so, though instead of *βαπτισμὸς* dipping, we have *ῥαντισμὸς* sprinkling; yet we have not that sprinkling instead of baptism, as if our sprinkling were no baptizing, but somewhat else instead of it: but we have it for what it really is, a true baptism in the larger sense, though it be not a *βαπτισμὸς* in the strict sense of that word as it signifies dipping; though sprinkling be not strictly dipping, yet it is truly baptizing.

§. 50. From *Zepperus* he is in haste to go to Dr. *Taylor*, (a Champion he often glories in,) and saith he, 'Dr. *Taylor*, in his *Rule* of *Conscience*, *l.* 3. *c.* 4. *p.* 644, 645. The 'Ancient Church did not in their Baptism sprinkle Water 'with their hands, but did immerge; and therefore we 'find in the Records of the Church, that the Persons to be 'baptized were quite naked, as it is to be seen in many 'places, particularly in the *Mystagogy Chat.* (as he writes 'it) of St. *Cyril*, and many others (as you have before 'in the second Chapter of this Part, from *Vossius*, *p.* 135.) And I shall follow him as fast to attend the motions of that Doctor. And I answer.

§. 51. Bishop *Taylor* did, as I, and all good men, I believe, would do, *i. e.* wish'd as near a conformity in the present

present Church to the Primitive, as the Circumstances of both may well permit: and therefore represents things tending that way as favourable as he could: but his words must not be tenter-hook'd, and stretch't to a meaning beyond his mind. And whether they be not so here, will be left to the Readers judgment. In this very Section and Paragraph he tells you, that of this Sprinkling, besides what is implyed in the former Testimonies, there was *some little use* in the Primitive Church. And he backs this saying of his with proofs from *Tertullian*, *Surius*, and *Walafrid Strabo*. When therefore he saith, that the Ancient Churches did not in their Baptisms sprinkle water with their hands, but immerged the Catechumen, or the *Infant* (for those are his words, which Mr. *D.* disguises, and curtails, and shrinks up into a barely, *but did immerge*, for ends best known to himself, but easily guessable at by any man, though of no greater abilities than I am) I say, in so saying, his words cannot in reason be taken, as if he meant, that absolutely and universally all without exception were then immerged, and none were sprinkled: for that is contradictory to what himself afterward in the same Paragraph saith and proveth, as I have already noted: but that mostly and generally it was so: the contrary practice being so infrequent (as not used in ordinary cases, but only such as were of high charity and great necessity) that it was little taken notice of in publick. So that speaking according to what was *generally* done, and *publickly* observed, he might infer from the Authorities by him insisted on, that the custom of the Ancient Churches was not sprinkling, but immersion. But though it may be granted, that the custom was not sprinkling, but dipping, yet it will not follow thence, that there was never any thing of that nature done in those times *contrary to the custom:* for the contrary is apparent. And therefore D. *Cave* in his Testimony cited by Mr. *D.* p. 200. speaks warily and safely in the case, saying, not absolutely, that it was the constant and universal custom of those times, but *the almost* constant and universal

verſal cuſtom. And ſo B. *Taylor* is to be underſtood, if we will make him conſiſtent with himſelf: as we muſt do, or elſe his Teſtimony will be nothing worth on either ſide, and he will be no more againſt us, than for us: and his quoting will ſignifie nothing more, but that the Quoter had a mind to make a noiſe with *his Name*, and object him to us, as being an eminent, not only member of, but Miniſter in our Church, and a Biſhop in that Church wherein he lived, when he publiſhed that Writing, at leaſt the ſecond time. I wonder the Quoter did not take notice of this concluſive paſſage of his, and eſpecially of what follows immediately added to the words recited by me, *viz.* That that cuſtom of the Ancient Churches was in purſuance of the ſenſe of the word in the Commandment, and the example of our Bleſſed Saviour. Which if he had, I have given anſwer thereto in theſe Papers, *ch.* 10. and 16. I ſhall only make this remark upon it in favour of Mr. *D.* That he is the more pardonable, if he ſometimes takes no notice of what is againſt him, when he can paſs by ſome, and ſuch notices, that ſeem to be for him. But if there be wilfulneſs on the one ſide, and but inadvertency on the other ſide, I ſhall then plead nothing for him, but leave him there to plead for himſelf.

§. 52. But Mr. *D.* goes on (and I ſhall follow him) 'And this Immerſion (ſaith he from Dr. *Taylor*) was of 'ſo Sacred an account in their eſteem, that they did not 'account it lawful to receive him into the Clergy, who had 'been only Sprinkled in his Baptiſm, as we learn from the 'Epiſtle of *Cornelius* to *Fabianus* of *Antioch*, *Euſeb. l.* 9. *c.* 43. 'It is not lawful that he who is ſprinkled in his Bed by 'reaſon of ſickneſs ſhould be admitted into Holy Orders, 'doubting whether ſuch a Sprinkling ſhould be called Bap-'tiſm.

§. 53. I wonder Mr. *D.* ſhould produce this inſtance: becauſe it is an unanſwerable proof of a baptizing by way of Sprinkling ſo early in the Church as the time of *Novatus*, of whom the ſtory is: and who no doubt, was not the

the first man, that was so baptized: because his being baptized so was pleaded in Bar against his admission into Orders, as being against *Law*: and so this instance is a clear evidence of such a practice even before his time, which falling to be about *anno* 250. it may well be presumed, that such baptizing was at least in the Century before, that is the second, if it were not also in the first (as who can say it was not?) Laws not being in that persecutious time of the Church so easie, and suddainly made for the Catholick Church: especially if it were unlawful by any *Canon*; (as I see none made for it before that time, though it came afterward into the Codex of Canons, being so established after in the *Council* of *Neocæsarea*) and much less if by custom: for that requires long time, and many instances, and much observation to be brought up by. And as to the Baptism it self, I apprehend it was not the unsufficiency of that, which made it unlawful for the so baptized to be admitted into Holy Orders, but other Reason, which I have given in these Papers, *ch.* 10. And as for *Novatus*'s Baptism, it is by *Cornelius* sufficiently owned to be a Baptism, whilst he accuses him for his forsaking of the Church of God, wherein he was baptized, as I have shewed there also. Which could not have been said with sense, if he had not at all been baptized; or if the baptism, which he had received, had been a nullity.

§. 54. As for those words added to what went before, as if they had been Dr. *Taylors* words [*doubting whether such a sprinkling should be called a baptism*] I cannot be just to the truth, unless I say, they are not Dr. *Taylors* words, but an Addition of Mr. *D*'s. as any that will consult the place may see. Yet something there is, that is near to, not altogether the same with, this passage: for it follows in the Doctor, Nay it went further than this, they were not sure, that they were rightly Christned, yea or no, who were only sprinkled; as appears in the same Epistle of *Cornelius* in *Eusebius*, εἴγε χρὴ λέγειν τὸ τοιοῦτον εἰληφέναι, which *Nicephorus* thus renders [*if at least such a sprinkling may*

he called a Baptism.] Yet this is but near to, not the same. For it is one thing, not to be done at all; and another thing not to be done rightly: and many things are not done rightly, which yet when done, are held valid and good: according to the Vulgar saying in this case, *Fieri non debuit, factum valuit.* That which they were not sure of was, not whether such a Sprinkling should be called a Baptism; but whether those that were only sprinkled, were rightly baptized: I say, not whether they were baptized at all, but whether they were baptized rightly, which is clear another thing from what Mr. *D.* would infer. And as for the Reason of *Cornelius* his words of doubt, I have spoken to that in *ch.* 10. and shewed it to be another thing. And if *Nicephorus* misunderstood him, who is to blame for that? There is a great deal of difference between those words [*if one ought to say, that such a man did receive baptism*] and these [*if at least such a sprinkling may be called baptism.*] For a total dipping into water by a due Minister, with a right form of words, is even in the Anabaptists Dictionary a baptism: and it cannot be said, but that such an immersion is a baptism. And yet of an Infant so baptized, an Anabaptist would say, [*if one ought to say, that such a one did receive baptism*] or rather he would deny that he did receive it. But I will suppose *Nicephorus* understood well enough what he said, and that his Translators did not understand him (I would be loth to say were willing to mistake him.) For what saith he? If *at least such a sprinkling may be called a Baptism.* He doth not say absolutely, if a Sprinkling, or any sprinkling, may be called a baptism: no, that was not the doubt with him: but if *such a sprinkling*, [that is, a *sprinkling given to such a person*, and in *such a condition*, at *such a time*, and not *consummated* by that, which was by the then Canon, or custom to have followed, as I have shewed *ch.* 10] may be called a baptism, which is no more than to say, if such a baptism, [be the manner of it, what it will] may be called a baptism. Which makes nothing to the purpose.

§. 55. But

§. 55. But to go on with Mr. *D.* 'And therefore (saith 'he as from Dr. *Taylor*) *Magnus* in his Epistle, questions 'whether they are to be esteemed right Christians, who are 'only sprinkled, and not dipped in water.

§. 56. Dr. *Taylors* words (which it had been more ingenuous, as I conceive, in producing his Testimony, to set down, as he spake them) are these. And this was not only spoken in diminution of *Novatus*, and indignation against his person: for it was a formal question made by *Magnus* to St. *Cyprian*, *an habendi sint Christiani legitimi, eò quòd aquâ salutari non loti sunt, sed perfusi.* Whether they are to be esteemed right Christians, who were only sprinkled with water, and not washed or dipped.

§. 57. Mr. *D.* sure was loth to hear baptism called by any other name, but what necessarily implies dipping; and therefore he left *washed* out: and yet *washed*, not *dipped* is St. *Cyprians* word: and perhaps his meaning too. For within a few lines he saith, The breast of the Believer is *washed* one way, the mind of man through the merits of Faith is cleansed another way. So that he seems not at all to speak of *dipping*, but of *washing*, and that of the *breast* only. And what if one *Magnus* (more scrupulous it seems than others) did make such a formal and solemn question? It follows not that all else, or any other besides him were unsatisfied about it. And it is apparent that St. *Cyprian* himself was well satisfied in the case. For he answers (as Dr. *Taylor* tells us, though Mr. *D.* does not, it being not for his interest so to do) that the baptism was good, when it is done *necessitate cogente, & Deo indulgentiam suam largiente*, in the case of necessity, God

Neque enim sic in Sacramento salutari delictorum contagia, ut in lavacro carnali & seculari sordes cutis & corporis abluuntur, ut & sapone & nitris & cæteris quoque adjumentis, & dolio, & piscinâ opus sit, quibus ablui & mundari corpusculum possit. Aliter pectus credentis abluitur, aliter mens hominis per fidei merita mundatur, Cypr. *l.* 4. *ep.* 7.

In Sacramentis salutaribus necessitate cogente & deo indulgentiam suam largiente, totum credentibus conferunt divina compendia. Id. ib.

 pardoning,

pardoning, and necessity compelling, or rather, as I think it ought to be rendred, necessity compelling, and God permitting.

§. 58. And this (he goes on) is the sense and Law of the Church of *England*; not that it be indifferent, but that all Infants be dipped, except in the case of sickness, and then sprinkling is permitted. And so it was in those times when the Doctor first wrote this. But the sense and Law of the Church of *England* is since that grown still a little more favourable. For in the Office of *Publick Baptism* of Infants the dipping of the Infant is appointed with an *If* [*if they shall certifie that the Child may well endure it.*] So then no such certification being made, the Minister is not appointed to dip it; nor is he required to *ask*, whether the Child may well endure it or no: and seeing them offer the Child to Baptism in such a condition as it is unfit to dip it in, he may in reason presume, without their certifying either way, that it may not endure it. Their very offering it in that condition is an Interpretative Certification of its inability to suffer baptization by a total immersion. And being that in the Office of *Baptism of persons of riper years*, dipping in the water, or pouring water on, is indifferently prescribed, and clearly left to the Minister's liberty, without *ifs* or *ands*, where yet the Person is of age and strength enough to endure it: he may rationally presume he is at the same liberty with Infants, of whose strength, in regard of their age, there is no ground for such presumption.

§. 59. After this the Doctor goes on to confirm the use of sprinkling from instance of some, though little use of it in the Primitive Church, which he shews from *Tertullian*, the Acts of St. *Laurence* in *Surius*; and *Walafrid Strabo*: and for further confirmation adds the Opinion of *Aquinas*, that the Three Thousand, and Five Thousand Converts in the *Acts*, were so baptized. All which Mr. *Danvers* is pleased to over-pass.

§. 60. But then having weakened this last proof from *Aquinas*,

Aquinas, by calling it but a *conjecture*, and ſaying it hath *no tradition*, nor *record* to warrant it, he draws towards the concluſion of that, which all this diſcourſe about dipping and ſprinkling is brought to prove, *viz.* that a cuſtom in the adminiſtration of a Sacrament introduc'd againſt the Analogy and myſtery, the purpoſe and ſignification of it, is not to be complied with, ſaying, And therefore although in caſes of need and charity the Church of *England* does not want *ſome good Examples* in the beſt times to countenance that permiſſion, yet we are to follow her command, becauſe that command is not only according to the meaning and intent of the word βαπτίζοντες in the commandment, but agrees with the myſtery of the Sacrament it ſelf; *For we are buried with him in baptiſm*, ſaith the Apoſtle; adding thereto this teſtimony from St. *Chryſoſtom*, which Mr. *D.* tranſcribes from him, *In aquâ tanquam in ſepulchro caput immergentibus vetus homo ſepelitur, & immergitur, deinde nobis emergentibus novus reſurgit inde.* 'The old Man is buried and drowned in the *immerſion under* 'water, and when the baptized Perſon is lifted up from the 'water, it repreſents the Reſurrection of the new Man to 'newneſs of life.

§. 61. In which part of the diſcourſe I cannot but note three things, which Mr. *D.* was not pleaſed to advert unto. Firſt, an acknowledgment, that the Church of *England* does not want ſome *good examples* in the *beſt times* to countenance her permiſſion of ſprinkling. *Good Examples*, and in the *Beſt Times*, are very material words for us, and give us an Antiquity as old, and as good, as we can deſire, and utterly overthrow all that ever can be ſaid againſt us, eſpecially on the account of Antiquity. Secondly, that the Analogy betwixt Immerſion and Emerſion, and the Death or Burial of the old Man, and Reſurrection of the new Man, is made the myſtery of the Sacrament, and by the manner of ſpeech ſo made the myſtery, as if it were the only myſtery of it: our waſhing from ſin by the blood of Chriſt, which is the prime ſignification and myſtery

of the Sacrament, being passed by, on no account, that I know of, unless, because if that were either the whole, or any part of the mystery of the Sacrament, that would hold analogy with sprinkling, and so weaken the Inference for Dipping. Thirdly, that whereas the Immersion St. *Chrysostom* speaks of, is, as far as his words will bear, but an immersion or dipping of the *head* [*caput immergentibus*, is his word] both the Doctor and Mr. *D.* slip that by, without the least notice of it, and hide it under a general ambiguous term of *immersion under the water*, which is apt to carry away the mind to think of a total immersion of the *whole man*, whileſt it is but the *head*, whole immerging the Father speaks of. At this rate who may not be made to say even what one wills?

§. 62. At length both the Doctor and Mr. *Danvers* come to a Conclusion. 'And therefore (saith Mr. *D.*) he 'concludes, That the contrary custom being not only against 'Ecclesiastical Law, but against the Analogy, and mysti-'cal signification of the Sacrament, is not to be complied 'with.

§. 63. But why did Mr. *D.* stop there? and not do the Doctor and the truth right, in adding the Exception following? Unless in such cases that be of themselves sufficient to justifie a liberty in a Ritual and Ceremony; that is, a case of necessity.

§. 64. To Mr. *D.* I shall answer first, That, as I conceive, the allowance of any such case or cases, were not consistent with his Hypothesis; and that the adding of those words would have made the Doctor's testimony unserviceable to his turn, and therefore he thought fit to leave them out. With how great ingenuity I leave to his own judgment.

§. 65. Then to the Doctor I say first, that the Custom of sprinkling is not now against our Ecclesiastical Law, which hath prescribed dipping, or pouring on of water indifferently in the case of the publick baptism of *persons of riper age*; and hath appointed pouring on of water in the case

caſe of the *ſick Infant* baptized privately; and hath neither appointed dipping, nor ſprinkling in the caſe of Infants brought to Publick Baptiſm, but accordingly as certification of their ability, or inability to endure dipping, ſhall be made. And then as to the Analogy and myſterious ſignification of the Sacrament, that ſprinkling or pouring on of water is not againſt that, but very agreeable with it, I have ſhewn at large in the Ninth Chapter of this Book, and ſhall further ſhew in the Sixteenth; whither I refer the Reader for his ſatisfaction. And in the mean time I think I may conclude that the advantage which Mr. *D.* hath gained to his cauſe by this great Man's teſtimony ſignifies as much as comes to nothing.

§. 66. I wonder Mr. *D.* ſlipt what the Doctor ſaith in the cloſe of his 15*th. Paragr. p.* 646. *viz.* that becauſe it is better to uſe dipping, and it is more agreeable to the myſtery to uſe it three times, and that ſo the Ancient Church underſtood it, therefore theſe things are a ſufficient warrant to acquit us from the obligation of the contrary cuſtom; becauſe a cuſtom againſt which there is ſo much probability, and in which there is no neceſſity and no advantage, is to be preſumed unreaſonable. The reaſon, if I may preſume to gueſs, was partly becauſe he ſaw the Doctor's diſpute lay not againſt the *unlawfulneſs*, but *obligatorineſs* of the contrary cuſtom. And he might ſee, that as the probability againſt it was not ſo great, as the Doctor fancied, ſo the neceſſity of it was ſometimes ſo much, and the advantages in caſes of neceſſity and charity ſo conſiderable, as that it could not be preſumed unreaſonable, but on the contrary ought to be judged very rational. Partly it was becauſe the Doctor doth in the very next words in the former clauſe of the ſame period aſſert, that *becauſe there is even in ſprinkling ſomething of the analogy of the myſtery, as is rightly obſerved by Aquinas, and Dominicus à Soto; and becauſe it is not certain that the beſt repreſentation, and the moſt expreſſive ceremony, is required; therefore the Church, upon great cauſe, may lawfully do either.*

Which he was unwilling any of his Party should know. And thus much for Dr. *Taylor*.

§. 67. From this Champion of our own Church, we are next called to receive a charge from a brisk Champion of the Church of *Rome*; nay from the *Church* of *Rome* it self, as Mr. *D.* words it. 'The *Church* of *Rome* (saith he) 'confesseth by a *Learned Pen*, the *Marquis* of *Worcester* 'in his *Certam. Relig.* That she changed dipping the Party 'baptized over Head and Ears, into sprinkling upon the 'Face.

§. 68. Mr. *D.* should rather have said, as I think, a Learned Pen of the Church of *Rome* confesseth. For not the writing of every Learned Man is presently the Confession of the Church he is of: for when so Learned Men of the same Church are of contrary judgments, and write contrary things, then the Church they are of must be judged to be so too: and that is to speak her a Church of no judgment. And the Church of *Rome* will not endure that. Nor would Mr. *Danvers*'s Church (I believe) be willing to espouse all his assertions as her Confessions. But that is to be taken for the Confession of a Church, which is professed by her in her publick Writings, compiled by Persons authorized thereunto, confirmed by the Subscription of her Ministers, and made authentick by the attestation of her Supreme Magistrates.

§. 69. But what is it that the *Marquis* saith she did? That she changed dipping into sprinkling. This cannot signifie that before that change there was no sprinkling at all in that Church: but that it wholly left off to dip, which had been the publick and solemn way of baptizing in that, as well as in other Churches; and in stead thereof, even in the publick and solemn baptizings, as well as in the private baptisms, upon cases of necessity, she baptized by way of sprinkling.

§. 70. And what was the change in this respect made? Dipping all the whole Body under the water into sprinkling upon the Face? The *Marquis*, even as Mr. *Danvers* quotes

quotes him, ſaith not ſo: but dipping the Party baptized over Head and Ears. That may mean no more, but dipping his Head only all over (and by a Pleonaſm of ſpeech, his Ears too) under water, and not his whole Body. And that ſuch a way of baptizing has been in uſe in the Weſtern Church, I have ſhewed before, *Ch.* 10. And if that were the Church of *Romes* meaning in what ſhe confeſſeth here by her *Learned Pen*, then Mr. *D.* gets nothing to his Cauſe by her Confeſſion.

But if not, yet ſtill what change ſoever ſhe made therein, ſhe did no more than ſhe lawfully might, being inveſted with the ſame power in ſuch caſes, as other Churches have; and the thing it ſelf being no ſubſtantial part, but only an accidental circumſtance of that Sacrament: wherein Churches have power to continue, or alter as they ſhall ſee beſt conducing to order, decency, and edification: and proceed upon grounds of neceſſity, charity, or great conveniency.

§. 71. But I am of opinion, it was not the Church of *Rome*, that made this Change: but a Church that had more power than that Church ever had, even the *Catholick Church*: which *Rome* is not any more, than any other particular *National Church* is; even ſo far as ſhe holds union, and fellowſhip with the Church *Catholick* in truth of Doctrine, Eſſentials of Worſhip, and Subſtantials of Diſcipline. And this appears, becauſe the Church the *Marquis* there ſpeaks of, is that Church, that could depoſite the obſervation of the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, and introduce the obſervation of the *Chriſtian Lord's Day*; which ſure was not done by that particular Church, but by the whole Catholick Church throughout the World. And that Church indeed that could do that, could without doubt change the dipping over Head and Ears in Water, into a little ſprinkling upon the Face, by reaſon of ſome emergencies and inconveniencies, occaſioned by the differences of Seaſons and Countries, (as the *Marquis* there adds) and may upon the like occaſion, accordingly diſpoſe of the manner of her adminiſtration

tion of her Sacraments. For sure to depose the observation of a day expressly commanded to be kept holy, and to introduce the like observation of another day, touching the keeping of which holy never any Command was given, (as none that we know of, was ever given for its sanctification, though in all probability it was founded in *Apostolical Practice* partly intimated in the Scriptures, and further notified by Tradition) implies a power as great as, if not greater than, to change a Rite in a Sacrament, not more commanded than the Sanctification of the Sabbath day, nor so much as that, if it were ever at all under any command, which is denyed by Learned men, as in those Papers is shewn.

§. 72. So then, if there were no change made, then we are as we were at first. And if there were a change made, it was made by a Church, whether the Catholick or Roman, that had power to make it. Either way will serve our turn. For which way soever it be, our practice will be free from guilt: either as being it self Primitive and Apostolick: or as being taken up into use instead of somewhat that then was used, by a Church that had power to make that change.

§. 73. Though after all, I shall not grant any change made herein, other than what I have already said, from a practice but privately used in case of necessity, to become the general practice, even where Baptism is administred with greatest solemnity.

§. 74. Having done with the *Marquis*, he goes on to tell us, 'that, until the *Third Century* we find not any, 'that upon any consideration, did admit of Sprinkling: 'and that the first we meet with is *Cyprian*. To which having spoken before, I shall say nothing, but that, if in that Century it was admitted, it hath a fair antiquity to plead for it self. But what probabilities there are of its having been practised before, I have already shewed, and therefore will not here repeat, but pass on to his next Authors.

§ 75. *Aquinas*, *Scotus*, and others of the Schoolmen conclude

conclude (as he tells us) 'that Dipping is moſt agreeable 'to the Inſtitution, but admit, that in caſe of neceſſity, 'viz. when either many are to be baptized, ſcarcity of 'water, or ſickneſs, or weakneſs, they may Sprinkle. '*Voſſ. p.* 38.

§. 76. Suppoſe they do conclude Dipping to be moſt agreeable to the Inſtitution, yet things are well enough with us, ſince they do not conclude it only to be agreeable to it. And if they admit it in caſe of neceſſity, then in that caſe they hold it lawful. For in no caſe would they admit of that, which they judged unlawful. Becauſe evil is not to be done, that good may come thereof. But to come cloſer to him.

§. 77. In what part of *Voſſius* this is ſet down Mr. *D.* names not. But I gueſs it is in his firſt *Diſput. de Baptiſmo, Theſſ.* 9. and *pag.* 358. for which the Printer by miſtake put 38. Touching which, if that be the place, I obſerve firſt, that it is not *Scotus*, that is named there, but *Sotus*; not *Jo. Scotus* that was an oppoſer, but *Dominicus Sotus*, that was a follower of *Aquinas*. But this might be a miſtake of the Printers.

§. 78. Secondly, that *no others* of the Schoolmen are there named, but thoſe two, *Aquinas* and *Sotus*. But it may be he put that in of his own head, beſides what he had in his Author. And yet if ſo, he ſhould not have vouched his Author for more than he named.

§. 79. Thirdly, that neither any School-men there named, nor *Voſſius* from them ſaith, That *Dipping is moſt agreeable to the Inſtitution*. Indeed *Voſſius* ſaith of *Aquinas*, that he ſaith, *merſionem quidem magis congruam eſſe*, that dipping is indeed more congruous; but he ſaith not to what. Mr. *D.* ſupplies it *to the Inſtitution*. I blame him not: it would make well for his cauſe, if it were ſo. But if we conſult *Aquinas* (in the place referred to, as I ſuppoſe, by *Voſſius*) 3. *q.* 66. *art.* 7. *conc.* there is no mention of the Inſtitution of Baptiſm, to

Cùm in baptiſmo aſſumatur aqua ad corporis ablutionem, non mo-

which

dò per immersionem, verùm etiam per aspersionem, vel effusionem aquæ baptismus dari potest: tutius tamen est (quia hoc habet communior usus) per modum immersionis baptizare. Aquin. 3. q. 66. art. 7. *Conclus.*

which Dipping is either most agreeable (as Mr. *D.* saith) or more agreeable than sprinkling, but of the *Common use* of the Church: in respect of which he saith it is the *safer* to baptize by way of immersion. A great deal of difference betwixt *more safe in respect of common use*, and *most agreeable to the Institution*. So that neither these *Schoolmen*, nor the *Quoter* of them, afford Mr. *D.* any the least patronage to his cause; which may justly be suspected so much the worse, in regard such *shifts* are used for the maintaining of it.

§. 80. Fourthly, I will fairly relate, what these *Schoolmen* say, and then leave the Reader to make his judgment on the case. The words of *Dominicus Sotus*, as *Vossius* quotes them from *dist.* 3. *qu. un. art.* 7. are these, *In baptismo aliquid est de essentiâ, ut ablutio, juxta illud ad Eph.* 5. *ubi Apostolus baptismum appellat lavacrum aquæ; aliud verò accidentarium: nempe ut ablutio hoc vel illo modo fiat.* In baptism something is *essential*, as *washing*, according to that *Eph.* 5. where the Apostle calls baptism the *washing of water*: and something is *accidental*, as that the *washing* be made *this or that way*. Now if so, then dipping is not of the Essence of Baptism, and so not necessarily to be always used in baptizing. But herein (saith *Vossius*) he followed *Thomas Aquinas*, who also himself saith, that dipping is truly the more congruous (*viz.* to the common use, as I said before:) and therefore thinks it ought not to be done otherwise unless for a reason that is either necessary, or honest, or at least agreeable unto reason. Yet notwithstanding inasmuch as water is taken in the Sacrament to signifie the washing of the Soul by the washing of the body, and that washing may be made not only by immersion, but also by effusion, and aspersion, he thinks truly that baptism may be administred after every one of these ways. And he adds four Causes for which it may be otherwise

wiſe done than by dipping, which are (1.) great multitudes of perſons to be baptized, (2.) Scarcity of water, as when there is not enough for dipping, (3.) Weakneſs of the Baptizer, unable to bear the perſon to be baptized, (4.) Sickneſs of the perſon to whom the baptiſm is to be adminiſtred, by reaſon of which he would be endangered if dipped. And now, Reader, I leave you to make what eſtimate you pleaſe of theſe Authors, *Aquinas*, *Sotus*, and *Voſſius*, and of their Quoter, Mr. *Danvers*. And I leave him to triumph, as much as he pleaſeth, in the advantage he hath gotten by this, or any other the like Quotations.

§. 81. After the Schoolmen he proceeds to draw to a concluſion by way of Recapitulation of Arguments from the *Genuine ſence* of the *word*, Nature of the *Ordinance*, and Uſuage of the *Ancients*, which he ſaith were excellently inculcated by the Learned Dr. *Tillotſon* in a Sermon preached at his Lecture in *Michaels Cornhil* London, *April* 15. 1673. from *Rom.* 6. 4. 'Therefore we are buried with 'him by Baptiſm into Death; proving from thence, that 'dipping or plunging was the proper Ceremony and Rite 'in that Ordinance; and how naturally Arguments did ariſe 'from that Sign in Baptiſm to enforce Holineſs and Mortifi-'cation the thing ſignified thereby.

§. 82. That that Reverend Divine did preach a Sermon in that place, and at that time, and on that Text, I am apt to believe. But what he ſaid in it is not ſo eaſie to know: For not Mr. *D.* gives us his words. And after many inquiries in the Country, and at laſt ſending for it to *London*, I underſtand that Sermon was never yet Printed. And therefore Mr. *D.* whom we have not found over candid in things that have been Printed, muſt excuſe us, if we be not over haſty to take his word in things that never yet came at the Preſs. As to the matter I eaſily believe that from the Rite of Dipping in Baptiſm there alluded unto by the Apoſtle, the Doctor did rationally deduce and powerfully inculcate Arguments to enforce to Holineſs and Mortification. But that the Doctor did proye, or had any ſuch deſign in that

that Sermon as to prove from that Text, that dipping or plunging was *the proper* Ceremony and Rite in that Ordinance, meaning by *the proper*, the only lawful Rite, whence must follow, that there was therefore a necessity of Dipping in Baptism, I am not satisfied, nor shall be, till he tell us so himself. *A proper* Ceremony and Rite I shall easily grant he might affirm it to be: because no body denies it. But that it was *the proper* Rite and Ceremony in the sense newly expressed and explained, I am very confident he never said, he never thought. Partly because the Doctor is too learned not to know better things than so, Partly because I suppose his own practice, as well as other mens, hath been to baptize after another manner. And partly because I am assured from himself, that what he said of the Apostles alluding in those words [*being buried with him in Baptism*] to the ancient Rite or Manner of Baptizing, which was immersion, was '*without any* '*mention, or so much as thought of any necessity thereby laid* '*upon Christians of observing punctually all the Circumstan-* '*ces, used in the Institution of this Sacrament, any more* '*than of the other.* Which not the Anabaptists themselves will say there is. And therefore the Reader may be satisfied, that, whatever Mr. *D.* suggest to the contrary, that Reverend Person is no more conformable in judgment than in practice to the Anabaptists; nor is by any thing that he hath writ, or said, a witness for them, and against the Practice of the Church of *England*, when by the allowance of the Church of *England* they baptize otherwise than by a total dipping, as in several cases they do and may do it, by her allowance.

Letter dated Jan. 31. 1677.

§. 83. And now, the field being thus far clear'd, I might fairly retreat. But because I discern two straglers behind and coming up at a distance, I will stand a while and receive their charge.

§. 84. The first is *Ainsworth* (who as we are told by Mr. *D.* saith) upon *Lev.* 15. 5. 'To baptize or wash his 'flesh,

'fleſh, as is expreſſed, *v.* 13. 16. meaning his whole body,
'and ſo the Greek Tranſlateth, ſhall waſh his body. The
'Hebrews ſay, every place where ought is ſaid in the Law
'of Bathing the fleſh, and waſhing the Cloaths of the un-
'clean, it is not meant, but of baptizing the whole body in
'water, *Maim. in Makraoth, c.* 1. *ſ.* 2. Figuring out our
'Sanctification by Chriſt, and his Spirit, by whom we
'*draw near to God, having our hearts ſprinkled from an evil*
'*Conſcience, and bodies waſhed with pure water, Heb.* 10. 22.
'*v.* 11. If a man be baptized all over, ſaving the tip of his
'little finger, he is yet in his uncleanneſs. And if clay or any
'ſuch thing cleave to the fleſh of a man, it is unclean ſtill as
'it was, and the baptizing profiteth them nothing, *c.* 1.
'*ſc.* 2, 7, 12, *&c.*

§. 85. The Greek Tranſlateth indeed *v.* 13. ſhall *waſh* his body, and *v.* 16. ſhall *waſh all his body*. But they do not Tranſlate it ſhall *dip* his body. I hope a thing may be waſhed, and waſhed all over, and yet not dipped. So their Tranſlation helpeth the cauſe nothing at all. And ſuppoſe the Hebrews ſay true, as I am not ſo much a Rabby as to manage diſpute on this head of diſcourſe: yet then this only follows, that baptizing the whole body is meant, whereever bathing of the fleſh is mentioned, but not that it is meant other where. And there is mention often enough of cleanſing with waſhing, where yet bathing is not mentioned. Though I am not ſatisfied that bathing doth in the notion of it neceſſarily imply dipping. Again there can be no Arguing from *this* ſort of waſhing, but to waſhings of the *ſame* ſort. But waſhing of Proſelytes for admiſſion into the Covenant is another thing from waſhing of Perſons from pollutions by Iſſues. And this waſhing is of divine Inſtitution: but whether the other were ſo is uncertain. Of this the Inſtitution clearly appears in the Word; and ſo it may be better judged of: but of the other there is not the like, if any appearance; and ſo of that we cannot be ſo certain in our judgment. Further, though it were never ſo much

Λέσει τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι. & λέσει ὕδατι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα.

as

as they say, yet still is that no obligation unto us, who are under another Dispensation, and have Liberties conferred on us by Christ, from that *yoke of bondage*, which was imposed on them by *Moses*, *until the times of Reformation*. See *Ch.* 8. of this Treatise. Lastly, I argue thus, If there is to be so much scrupulosity in the baptizing of Christians, as the Rabbies say there was in the baptizing of *Jews*, and the same things rendered the baptism of the one of no effect, which rendered the baptism of the other ineffectual; then it would follow, that though the whole body of a Man were put under water, as the Dippers would have it, yet through the adherency of clay, or some other adventitious, perhaps excrementitious, matter to his body, he might still be unbaptized: and we should be as uncertain on that account, when any Person were truly baptized, as they are in the Church of *Rome*, on account of the Priests Intention to baptize. If there is not to be that scrupulosity among us, as was amongst them, then why are their customs in that kind so scrupulously urged upon us? This for *Ainsworth*.

§. 86. Then for Dr. *Goodwin*. 'To this purpose we 'have Dr. *Goodwin*, in his *Support of faith*, *p.* 54. very excellently, *viz.* That the eminent thing signified and represented in Baptism, is not simply the blood of Christ, as it washeth us from our sins; but there is a further representation therein of Christ's Death, Burial and Resurrection in the Baptized, being first buried under Water, and then rising out of it; and this is not in a bare conformity to Christ, but in a representation of communion with Christ in that his Death and Resurrection: Therefore it is said (we are buried with him in baptism) and wherein we are risen with him, *&c.*

§. 87. That the blood of Christ, as it washeth us from sin, is represented in Baptism, is tacitly consented to by that Doctor in this place: and that it is the eminent thing signified, and represented in it. But that it is not *simply* so, (I suppose he means, that it is not *only* so, or that that

is

is not *all* the thing which is ſignified, and repreſented in it) but there is a further repreſentation therein, *&c.* is the thing, if I underſtand the Doctor, aſſerted by him. Wherein I know none will contradict him; provided he make not that, which was the primary deſign of baptiſm, to truckle to other ſecondary deſignations by it.

§. 88. But here I obſerve the Doctor is not writing about Dipping, or Sprinkling, in a way of Diſpute for the one, and againſt the other, nor meddles in the leaſt in thoſe Points, in a way of controverſie: only ſhows how that by the baptized's being firſt buried under Water, and then riſing out of it, (which is a way of ſpeaking familiar to Divines, even thoſe that own and avow the lawfulneſs of ſprinkling) a repreſentation is made of Chriſt's Death, Burial, and Reſurrection. And no doubt it is ſo, and very eminently, where the Baptiſm is that way adminiſtred. But there is a repreſentation alſo made of theſe things by aſperſion and perfuſion. (as will be further ſhewed in *Ch.* 16.) And therefore there being no oppoſition between what that Doctor aſſerts, and I affirm, I diſmiſs his Teſtimony, as a thing alledged impertinently by Mr. *D.* as to the purpoſe in hand, if it were, as doubtleſs it was, by him deſigned to be excluſive of other ways of baptizing, beſides Dipping. And I conclude, that *by the alteration of this Rite from Dipping to Sprinkling, the Symbol is not* (as Mr. *D.* ſaith it is) *quite ſpoiled, nor made any other thing, than the Inſtitutor of it did deſign it*; *viz.* a Sacrament whereby his waſhing us from our ſins with his blood is repreſented, as the *primary* deſign of it; and his Death, Burial, and Reſurrection, as the *ſecondary*.

And now after this Interruption to my Diſcourſe in Anſwer to Authorities alledged by Mr. *D.* againſt my Hypotheſis, I ſhall proceed in what I intended.

CHAP. XIV.

The Churches Grounds for admitting of Sprinkling, *in general.*

§. 1. THat *Baptism* by other ways than that of a *total immersion*, and particularly by *pouring* or *sprinkling* of water on the baptized, hath been practised in the Church, of ancient as well as later times, hath sufficiently (I hope) been made to appear, by what hath on that Subject already been delivered in these Papers.

Perhaps it may not be unprofitable to make Inquiry into the *Reasons*, or *Occasions*, of the Churches gradual declining, from the first more general way of *dipping*, to that less usual way of *sprinkling*, which yet is now grown to be the more general way.

§. 2. And truly I cannot think it proceeded from any wanton humour in the Church, causlesly to throw off any *Precept* of Christ's, or *Practice* of the Apostles. Far be that from being thought of that Company of Men, who are *called to be Saints*, and who know themselves to be no further such, than they keep both to *his* Precepts, and to *their* Practice, in things wherein their conformity thereunto is indispensably required. What shall we think then in the case? This, as I humbly conceive; and no more but this: That when the Church saw, that there was nothing in the *Precept of Christ*, nothing in the *Practice of the Apostles*, whereby it was bound up into so strait a room, as to be confined in all, even the greatest cases of necessity to *one way of baptizing*, and particularly to that of a *total immersion*, it made use of that power about the *Rituals* of Religion, and *Circumstantials* of Worship, wherewith Christ, as his Trustee on Earth, after his departure to Heaven, for the managing of the affairs of his Kingdom here,

here, till his coming again, had endued it; * and in order both to the fulfilling of that, which being the declared will of his Father must needs be interpreted to be his will too, even that of *having mercy, and not* (*i.e.* rather than) *ſacrifice*: and to the performing of that Precept of his Apoſtle, whereby he commanded that *all things* in the Church ſhould *be done* εὐσχημόνως, with an *honeſt decency*, on juſt occaſions waved that ſeverer way of baptizing by a *total immerſion*, and admitted the other more benign ways of *affuſion* and *conſperſion*.

* *Ut inſtituendi alicujus ritûs ſi uſus exigat, ita ejus abrogandi, ſi abuſus requirat, Eccleſia habet poteſtatem.* Voſſ. *de Bapt. diſp.* 1. *Theſ.* 8. *pag.* 347.

§ 3. How far the Church was from being enforced by any indiſpenſable Precept of Chriſt's, to keep ſolely to the way of a *total immerſion*, has been ſhewn (and, I would fain hope, ſufficiently) in the foregoing Papers. And, if nothing elſe had been ſaid, to any modeſt Inquirer this, methinks, might be ſufficient to perſwade, that our Saviour intended only a *preſcription* of the *ſubſtance* of the Ceremony, that Men *ſhould* be *baptized*, and not a *deſcription* of the *Circumſtance* of it, or manner *how* they ſhould be baptized, in that, whereas he knew there were in uſe among the *Jews*, diverſe *waſhings* called *baptiſms*, ſome *total* of all the Body; ſome partial, only of the *hands*, &c. having in a general term preſcribed the *matter*, he adds not one ſyllable to determine the *manner*; neither ſaying, baptizing their *Heads*; nor baptizing their *Hands*, nor baptizing their *whole Bodies*; neither *ſprinkling* them with water; nor *dipping* them into water; nor *pouring* water upon them, nor particularizing any manner of way how he would have the *application of water* made to them: and conſequently that the Church keeping to the *ſubſtance*, was by him left at liberty to determine her ſelf as to the *circumſtance*, baptizing this, that, or the other way, as reaſon, from conveniency, expedience, or *neceſſity* ſhould perſwade.

§. 4. And that ſhe was not bound up to a *total immerſion* by the *Practice* of the Apoſtles, it ſufficiently appears from this, that whereas there are ſeveral Inſtances of baptiſms by the Apoſtles, which with great probability may be preſumed to have been performed by *ſprinkling*, or *pouring of water* on the baptized, no one example can be produced of any one Apoſtles baptizing any, which carries with it any more than a probability of its being performed by *dipping*; of no one of them, by what is expreſſed in the Text, can it certainly be ſaid, that it was a *total immerſion*. So then there being but probability againſt probability, and no infallible certainty on either ſide, what could the Church think other, or what other can any Man imagine the Church ſhould think, but that in ſuch caſe ſhe had power to determine her ſelf to one way, or to be at liberty, to uſe both, or neither, according to her diſcretion.

§. 5. But methinks I hear ſuch a Thunder in mine Ears about *Philip*'s baptizing the *Eunuch*, (*Act.* 8. 38.) that I am not able to get any further, before I ſay ſomething to it. Well then, let us calmly conſider the Caſe. *Philip* having converted the *Eunuch* by preaching unto him *Jeſus*, *as they went on their way*, (v. 36.) *they came unto a certain water, and the Eunuch ſaid, See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? Philip* hereupon conſenting to it, upon his further profeſſion of *faith in Jeſus Chriſt*, (v. 37.) *He commanded the Chariot to ſtand ſtill: and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him.* This is the caſe. Now what is here, that neceſſarily infers a *total immerſion?* The *Eunuch* ſaid, *Here is water.* True: but he doth not ſay, how much of the water there was. *Here is water*, he ſaith; that's true indeed; but he doth not ſay, here is a *River*, here is a *Pool*, here's water enough for me to be dipped into. It is ſaid, *John was baptizing in Ænon, becauſe there was much water there.* But here the *muchneſs*, (if I may ſo ſpeak) or quantity of the water is not by the *Eunuch* inſiſted on, as

any

any reaſon why he ſhould here be baptized. He doth not ſay, here *is much water*, but only *here is water* (without *much*:) *what doth hinder me to be baptized?* which fairly intimates unto us, that where there is water, be it much or little, there a baptiſm may be.

§. 6. But it is ſaid, that both *Philip and the Eunuch went into the water.* Now ſure that they might do, though the water were far from being ſo much, as to be capable of receiving a mans *whole body* into it, ſo *to be baptized* in it, as the manner of the *Jews* was, *ſitting*, or rather *ſtanding* up to the neck in it. He that goes into the water but up to the knees, as truly goes into it, as he that goes up to the breaſts. Their going into it then enforces not the *Eunuchs* being wholly dipped in it.

§. 7. And then no more does their *coming out of it.* For cannot a man be ſaid to come out of the water, unleſs he have been firſt all, over head and ears, in it? He that is in the water but up to the *ancles*, as truly, when he leaves it, comes out of it, as he that goes into it up to the neck.

§. 8. Yea, but it is not barely ſaid, they came out of it, but they *came up out of it.* Well then: if *coming up* out of the water ſignifies a having firſt been all in it, then it ſeems *Philip* was dipped too, as well as the *Eunuch*: for it is not ſaid of the *Eunuch* ſingly, that he came up out of the water, but of him and *Philip* joyntly, that *they* (that is they *both*) came up out of the water. If then no *total dipping* of *Philip* follows upon his coming up out of the water (a thing never pretended by any, and unimaginable in it ſelf) there follows none from the numerically ſame expreſſion of the *Eunuchs* coming up out of it. No more being ſaid of him than of *Philip*, but the ſelf and ſame of both.

§. 9. Yea, but it is ſaid ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, *i. e.* they *aſcended out of the water.* Yes, juſt as it is ſaid, κατέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, they *deſcended* into the water. The Objection is too trifling to deſerve a ſerious anſwer. How can there be a going into the water, eſpecially ſuch a one as this is

ſuppoſed to be, a water in, or by the high way, without going down into it? where lie confluences of waters, but in low places, which muſt be gone down to by thoſe that will go into them? where is there ſuch a water, though on the top of the hill, that is not lower at the bottom of it, than the earth that bounds it, ſo that there can be no going into it, but there muſt be a going down to it? *Deſcending* then, or going down unto it, or even into it, does not neceſſarily ſuppoſe a going ſo far into it, as till one be over head and ears in it. No more than doth *aſcending*, or coming up out of it. One may well enough aſcend, or come up out of the water, who has been no further than knee deep in the water.

§. 10. But ſtill it is ſaid of the Eunuch, that being in the water *Philip* ἐβάπτισεν αὐτὸν *baptized* him. Yes, and that he might well enough do without a *total dipping* of him. He might ſprinkle water in his face, *pour water* upon his head, waſh him with *taking water* by *handfuls* and caſting it upon his body, or rubbing him therewith, or might dip *his* head, and no more of him, into it; and yet ſtill here was a baptizing, though no total immerſion of him. Here's nothing then but the mere force of the word ἐβάπτισεν to perſwade to it. And then any other Text of the New Teſtament, where St. *Peter* or St. *Paul*, or any other Apoſtle is ſaid to have baptized any, might to as much purpoſe be alledged as this Text, that there is ſuch a ſtir about. Now to go about to go to confute the Inference drawn from the ſignification of the word is needleſs here: for that were but to ſay over again all that hath already been ſaid on that ſubject, which I hope the Reader bears in mind: and therefore I ſhall neither trouble my ſelf nor him with it: but leave it to him to judge of it.

§. 11. And yet again, that this Baptiſm was by *Conſperſion*, or *affuſion*, rather than *immerſion* (unleſs of the *head*, or face only) may ſeem probable. Becauſe, Firſt, there is no mention of their putting off their clothes, when they went into the water; which indeed it was but neceſſa-

ry,

ry, as the case stood with them, that they should keep on, unless they meant to catch their deaths, the season being supposed to be in Winter, not long after the stoning of St. *Stephen*, and they in a journey upon the high-way, where they could have no fire to warm them, after their coming up almost starved with going naked into the cold water; and unnecessary they should put off, being the business might be done without it, by going but only with their legs bare into the Water. Secondly the *Eunuch*, being (as I suppose) a Black Moor, may be well thought to be unwilling to be wholly stripped naked before St. *Philip*, who was a *White*. Thirdly, there is no mention of the manner of *Philips* baptizing him expressed, that enforces to think it otherwise, it being not said, ἐβάπτισεν ἀυτὸν εἰς ὕδωρ, that he dipped him into the water, but only that ἐβάπτισεν, he baptized him, which might be as well, (nay more conveniently, as circumstances might be) by *conspersion*, as by *immersion*. And fourthly, I can find no water in the way, that the *Eunuch* travelled in, fit for the purpose of a Jewish *total immersion*, but a Brook in a Vally, or a Spring bubling up at the foot of a hill to do it in: neither of which probably were deep enough for it; and the rather because it is not said, that he dipped him into it.

See Dr. Caves *Life of St.* Philip *the Evangelist, Sect.* 11. *pag.* 30.

§. 12. But suppose it probable, notwithstanding all that I have said, that his Baptism was by *dipping*: yet probability is no certainty, and so can afford no demonstration. And if it be but probable that it was so, then it may be probable (nay I have shewn something of a probability) that it was not so. And then what's all the noise of *Philips dipping* the *Eunuch* come to? To nothing else but mere noise. And I wish that they who use that Argument, would weigh it better before they use it again, to confront therewith the Authority and Practice of the Church, when she makes use of that Liberty and Power, wherewith Christ, the Head of his Church, hath invested her; and

ordereth, or practiſeth baptiſm any other way, than by a total immerſion.

§. 13. I might add after all this, that had all things been here as their hearts could wiſh, yet ſtill this had been no example of any Apoſtle. For it was but *Philip* the *Deacon*, not *Philip* the *Apoſtle*, that baptized the Eunuch. An Apoſtolical perſon, or, if ye will, an Apoſtle, in the larger ſenſe (as *Clemens*, *Ignatius*, or any other of the Primitive Fathers are called Apoſtles) he was: but no Apoſtle in the ſtrict ſenſe we now ſpeak of, as deſigning by that Appellation only thoſe Eleven Perſons, who were by our Saviour, juſt at his *Aſcenſion*, ſent by him (and from his ſending them called *Apoſtles*) into all Nations, to make Diſciples all the world over, by teaching and baptizing them, with *Matthias*, after, by divine appointment, elected to take part of that Miniſtery and Apoſtleſhip.

§. 14. And had he been never ſo much an Apoſtle, yet ſtill that could only have warranted the *lawfulneſs* of *dipping*, not enforced a *neceſſity* of it. Unleſs one could have been ſure, both that no Apoſtle baptized any other way, and that they all decreed, that their example ſhould in that particular, be binding to all poſterity; or that all, or any one of them, had by a peremptory irreverſible determination from heaven declared, that none ever ſhould be baptized any other way. But who can be aſſured of the *firſt*, that has not been made privy to all the actings of all the Apoſtles in that kind, in all places whereever they went and planted Churches? And who can be aſſured of the *ſecond*, who has not heard or read all, that they all ever decreed, preach'd or writ? or has not an infallible aſſurance (which no mortal man can have,) that neither all of them, nor any one of them, ever decreed, writ, or preach'd, any thing, to the contrary?

§. 15. And ſo now, upon ſerious conſideration, I refer it to the moſt prejudicate Reader to ſay, what enforcement can lie upon the Church from *Philips* baptizing the Eunuch, to neceſſitate her to the dipping of all ſhe baptizes.

§. 16. And

§. 16. And now the Church being ſuppoſed at liberty, for any thing either in the Precept of Chriſt, or Practice of his Apoſtles, to uſe what way ſhe pleaſed in baptizing, I will purſue my intended courſe of ſhewing, on what accounts ſhe firſt more *ſparingly permitted*, and after more *freely admitted*, baptizing by way of *Sprinkling*.

CHAP. XV.

The Churches particular Inducements to admit of Sprinkling.

§. 1. BAptiſm in the *foremoſt Ages* of the Church, how little account ſoever any may make of it in this, was held *neceſſary* in order to ſalvation. No coming for any into the Kindom of heaven, that might have baptiſm, and deſpiſed it, or neglected it, was believed then. Yea ſome in proceſs of time went ſo far (perhaps too far) as to hold, not as the Church now holds, a neceſſity in the ordinary way, without tying God to the means, but an abſolute neceſſity of it (ſo as that the ſalvation even of *Infants*, who could neither ſeek it, nor deſire it, nor deſpiſe it, nor neglect it, if they died *unbaptized*, was by ſome doubted, diſputed, denyed) unleſs that defect were ſupplied *baptiſmo ſanguinis*, with the bloody Baptiſm of *Martyrdom*. How rightly this was believed and held, is not my

For excepting the caſe of *Martyrs* (whom they thought ſufficiently qualified for heaven by being *baptized in their own bloud*) they reckoned no man could be ſaved without being baptized. Dr. *Cave*, Prim. Chriſtian. part. 1. ch. 10. pag. 300.

We hold the ſame Neceſſity of Baptiſm, that the Fathers did hold. which is *viâ ordinariâ*: yet *non alligando gratiam dei ad media*, no more than the Schoolmen do. B. *Andrews* Anſw. to Peron. p. 12.

Niſi enim renatus fuerit ex aquâ & ſpiritu ſancto, non poteſt introire in regnum Dei. Utique nullum excipit, non in-

santem, non aliquâ præventum necessitate. D. Ambros. de Abrahamo *Patriarcha. l. 2. c 11. Sine baptismo mortuos periisse non dubium est. Id. de Voc. Gent. l. 2. c. 8. Sed antequam per ætatem possit homo vivere secundùm spiritum, necessarium habet Mediatoris Sacramentum—— D.* Aug. *l. 10. de Genes. ad literam, c. 14. Parvulis non sufficit fides ecclesiæ sine Sacramento: qui si absque baptismo fuerint defuncti, etiam cùm deferuntur ad baptismum, damnabuntur—* P. Lombard. *l. 4. dist. 4. c. 5. p. 387.*

my present concern to enquire, much less to determine. Sufficient it is to my present purpose, that it was (as I think none, that has had any insight into *Antiquity*, but will say that it was) so believed and held.

§. 2. Yet this notwithstanding, it is evident, beyond all possibility of dispute, or doubt, that many in the Primitive times who did believe this, did, for all that belief, defer their baptism, not only till their *old age*, but to their *death-beds*, or what they thought might be so. Their reasons why they did so are not one, but many, as I have abundantly elsewhere declared. It may be sufficient to note here three or four of them. Some did it out of *lothness to part with the world*, and their *sins*, and their *pleasures*, as thinking that, if once they took the Yoke of Christ upon them, they must thenceforth renounce, not the devil only, and all his works, but also the Pomps and Vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh; assuring themselves, that, though they enjoyed the pleasures of sin for never so long a season, yet if they could but get to be *baptized* at last, though it were never so late first, (not till they were upon their death-bed, and at the last gasp) all their sins past should be forgiven them.

Preface to Mod. Plea for Inf. Bapt.

§. 3. Some did it out of an *apprehension*, that though they did by baptism obtain remission of all forepast sins, though never so many and great, yet *if they sinned after Baptism, for such sins there was no pardon*: and therefore as knowing the multitude of temptations they must daily be exposed to in the world, and their own weakness to resist them, to prevent

prevent endangering the forfeiture of their pardon for what was paſt, and ſecure their preſent peace, and future ſalvation, they would not be baptiz'd, till they thought themſelves to have out-ſail'd all rocks and ſhelves, to be paſt all ſtorms and dangers, to have arrived in the port of happineſs, and to have nothing more to do, but through the gate of death to enter into eternal life.

§. 4. Some did it *to avoid* the *danger* of *Perſecution* for religion; ſince, till they were baptized, they could neither by the cunning of the *perſecuting Heathens* be diſcovered, nor by the cowardiſe of any perſecuted Chriſtians be betrayed, to be of the Chriſtian Faith: and ſo would not embody themſelves with the Church all their life, though they meant to expire in her boſom at their death; as knowing by her principles and practices, that She did ſympathize with him that was her Head, and would not be willing that any ſhould periſh, but be ready to ſave all thoſe that would not deſtroy themſelves, and open her Arms to relieve their Souls at the laſt gaſp of their bodies.

See Dr. Cave *Prim. Chriſt. part.* 1. *c.* 10. *pag.* 308.

§. 5. Whether upon theſe or any other Reaſons, as there were many, I ſay not; but ſo it was, that the *baptiſm* of very many was *deferred* to the utmoſt extremity; and there was a *neceſſity*, either of baptizing them then, in that condition, or of letting them depart out of this world unbaptized, or venturing it at leaſt.

§. 6. What ſhould the Church do in this condition? ſhould ſhe ſtop her ears againſt their cries? ſhut her eyes againſt their tears? harden her heart againſt their prayers, and deny them baptiſm? Where were then her compaſſion to Souls? How ſhould ſhe ſhew herſelf merciful as her heavenly Father is merciful? with what heart could ſhe ſhut any out of Gods Kingdom, that ſought with prayers and tears to be let into it? Why ſhould ſhe let any be damned, or but dye in danger of damnation, that by her means might be delivered and ſaved? Yea, why ſhould ſhe let any

dye

dye in deſpair or diſconſolate, when ſhe was able to open to them a door of hope, and draw out for them a breaſt of conſolation?

§. 7. Should ſhe grant them *baptiſm*, but on condition they would be *totally dipped?* Alas! that were either as ill as a denyal, becauſe it would propound a condition they were incapable of performing; or elſe, whilſt ſhe exerciſed mercy towards their Souls, to be acting cruelty to their bodies; to make ſure of ſending ſome out of this World, who elſe might have lived longer in it: an act ſo like murder, and ſo near killing, that it would be hard, amongſt any that were Chriſtians, to find either a hand or a heart, that could do it; much more, amongſt Miniſters, who would never be perſwaded it were either any part of their office, to kill Men for their ſalvation; or any of God's methods, to deſtroy Mens lives, for the preſerving of their Souls.

§. 8. What then ſhould ſhe do? What? but take the middle way: neither deny them, nor dip them: but (what would neither endanger Body, nor Soul, neither deſtroy Life, nor endamage Health) baptize them by a gentle *application of water* to them in the way of *Sprinkling*. And this is the way which the Church in the Primitive times did take, and hath perſevered in, on ſuch like occaſions; as hath, I hope, been competently evidenced in theſe Papers.

§. 9. And what *Neceſſity* (real, or but ſuppoſed, for that's all one) could perſwade to in one caſe, was the eaſilier yielded to in other the like caſes. Such as is that of *new born Infants*, of whom many are really ſick when born; ſo ſick, that, as if they came into the World only to cry for a Tomb to be buried in it, they depart almoſt as ſoon as born, ſcarce, nay ſometimes not at all living till

Et ſervari debet cùm neceſſitas imminet— propter infirmitatem vel impotentiam baptizati. Bonavent. *l.* 4. *diſt.* 3. *a.* 2. *qu.* 2.

Poteſt etiam fieri per modum effuſionis *vel* aſperſionis—*propter periculum pueri de cujus morte timetur.* Lyndwood. *Conſtitut. l.* 3. *c.*

till they can, though with the expedition of the moſt compendious method, be got baptized. And of thoſe whoſe condition appears more ſound and healthful, many ſuddainly have alterations, and are gone in a moment, when any ſuch thing was leaſt expected. And therefore the condition of the whole ſort of them hath been held but the ſame with, or near a-kin to that of elder perſons in ſickneſs, and ſo they thereupon, to prevent the worſt which they might feel, or others fear, have been thought proper Subjects of baptiſm, and admitted in all Ages thereunto, if offered to it. And truly, of the two, favour would caſt the ſcale on their ſide, in regard that, as they need it, as well as the others, ſo, though they do not deſire it, as others do; yet they have neither refuſed it, nor neglected it, when they might have had it, as others have done.

de Baptiſmo. —Vel propter debilitatem baptizandi cui poteſt imminere periculum mortis ex immerſione. Aquin. *Sum.* 3. *q.* 66. *a.* 7. *c.*

Praterea cur Aſperſionem *quæ jam obtinet in* Eccleſiis *noſtris retineri poſſe credamus*, charitatis & neceſſitatis *Lege compellimur. Siquidem ut* Nuda Corpora, *præſertim* Infantùm (*quales ferè ſunt qui nunc* Baptizantur) aeri frigido *exponantur*, & Aquis Tota *immergantur, in hiſce ad* ſeptentrionem *ſitis regionibus, præſertim hyberno tempore, ſine valetudinis periculo fierè non poteſt.* Voſſ. *de Bapt. Diſp.* 1. *Theſ.* 9. 356, 357.

§. 10. And if *weakneſs* in the *baptized* might excuſe them from being *dipped*, then might *Infirmity* in the *Baptizer* excuſe him alſo from *dipping*. This may be a very real caſe, for ought I know, unleſs the Miniſtry were by ſome ſpecial priviledge exempted from weakneſs by Age or ſickneſs. And if it were not ſuppoſable, ſuch learned, and judicious Perſons as, not *Lynwood* only, but *Aquinas*, and *Bonaventure*, would never have pleaded for *ſprinkling* upon the

Et hoc maximè eſt verum quando neceſſitas incumbit etiam propter imbecillitatem ſacerdotis *non potentis ſuſtentare infantem.* Lynwood. *Conſtitut. l.* 3. *c. de Baptiſ.*

Quandoque autem poteſt ipſi imminere neceſſitas— propter debilitatem Miniſtri, *quia non poteſt ſuſtentare baptizandum.* Aquin. *Sum.* 3. *q.* 66. *a.* 7. *c. Et ſervari debet cùm neceſſitas immi-*

account

net, aut propter infirmitatem baptizantis, *quia manus sunt debiles, &c.* Bonaventur. *l.* 4. *dist.* 3. *a.* 2. *q.* 2.

account of it. For this they make one piece of that necessity, upon account whereof a *total immersion* is abatable, and *consperſion* admittable.

§. 11. And what Necessity there is to allow of baptizing by way of *sprinkling*, in case the *Minister*, by reason of natural or adventitious weakness, be unable to lift into, and out of the Font, any heavy Child, the same will be pleadable for its allowance in case the *Number* of Persons to be baptized be such, as exceeds the strength of him, that otherwise is not weak, to dispatch their baptism by *dipping*. For wearines reduces him that is strong, for the present, into the condition of weakness. And he that has lost his strength with labour, is so far equal with him that had it not to labour with.

§. 12. Now this case hath no doubt already many a time happened, not only when *multitudes* of *Heathen Nations* turning Christians have come flocking, Men and Women, and Children, to Baptism; as the *Saxons* in *England* and *Germany*, and *Pomerania*; as also the *Lithuanians* and *Polonians*; but also when the times of *publick baptizing*, especially for *Catechumens*, were but only two in the Year, *Easter*, and *Whitsuntide*, and at the Mother Church. Which in populous Cities, and in the times of growing Christianity, must needs occasion the Numbers of the baptized to be, as they sometimes were, very great, enow to tire the most brawny arms of all the Ministers of any one City wholly to *immerse* them: and especially when Infants, not just new born only, but those also of some Months, it may be Years

- *Pontifex, nocte sanctâ* Pentecostes, *vigiliis celebratis, ad baptisterium foras muraneum egressus est, ibique omnis multitudo coram eo prostrata* baptismum *flagitavit. At ille præ gaudio lacrymans, cunctos aquâ abluens & Chrismate liniens in sinu matris Ecclesiæ congregavit. Fuerunt autem qui baptizati sunt amplius quingenti.* Baron. *Ann. Chr.* 579. *N.* xxvi. The time when *Baptism* was wont to be administred: at first all times were alike, and persons were baptized as opportunity and oc-

Years old, were brought to be baptized. And upon this account those that look upon St. *Peter*, as the alone Baptizer of the Converts in *Act.* 2. & 3. argue to his baptizing by way of *sprinkling*, because of his *insufficiency* to baptize so many by way of *dipping*. And it may very rationally be supposed of any other, when the like or any near case hath happened. And it is most rational to allow the same liberty, that he is supposed to have taken, unto any other, if the like case shall again happen, as it may, though it be unlikely, in the general conversion of the *Jews*, *Turks*, or *Heathens* to the Christian Faith.

§. 13. And because an *immersion* cannot be, without a sufficient quantity of water to receive wholly into it the person to be immersed, therefore the *defect* of that hath been looked upon as a case rendring baptism by *sprinkling*, not only lawful, but necessary. And this is a case that is rationally supposable in *hot Countries*, and *droughty seasons*, and night times, upon suddain emergencies. Water being not at all times, and in all places to be had, when there may be a necessity for baptism, in sufficient quantity for the *immersion* either of a

casion served; but the discipline of the Church being a little setled, it began to be restrained to two solemn and stated times of the Year, viz. *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, Dr. *Cave* Prim. Christianity, *part* 1. *ch.* 10. *p.* 306. *Vid. Novarin. Scbediasm. Sacroprophan. l.* 3. *c.* 9. *Num.* 47. Lambert. Danæi *Ethic. Christian. l.* 2. *c.* 10. *pag.* 121. *col.* 1. *B.* Baron. *Ann. Chr.* 723. *Num.* 9. Zuingeri *Theatrum, Vol.* 2. *l.* 3. *pag.* 4171, 4172. *Et verisimile est quòd non per modum* immersionis *sed* aspersionis *baptizaverit Apostolus* Petrus, *ad cujus prædicationem legitur unâ die* quinque millia, *& aliâ die* tria millia *conversos ad fidem baptizasse.* Lynwood *Constit. l.* 3. *de Baptismo. Et hoc propter necessitatem*; vel *quia* est magna multitudo *baptizandorum, ut patet Act.* 2. *&* 4. Aquin. *Sum.* 3. *q.* 66. *a.* 7. *c*

Quandoque autem potest tamdiu cessare necessitas propter paucitatem aquæ. Aquin. *Sum.* 3. *q.* 66. *a.* 7. *c. Et hoc maximè verum est, quando necessitas incumbit* propter defectum aquæ. Lynwood *Constit. l.* 3. *c. de Baptismo. Et servari debet cum necessitas imminet* — propter penuriam elementi, *ut si sit modicum de aquâ.* Bonavent. *l.* 4. *dist.* 2. *a.* 2. *q.* 2. *Item esto quòd sit ita* parum de

man,

aquâ, *quòd non posset mergi una pars, quæritur utrum possit baptizari, & videtur quòd sic, quia est ibi verbum & elementum, &c. Id. ib.*

man, or of a child. And this defect *Aquinas*, *Lynwood*, and *Bonaventure* instance in as a case of necessity for a baptism by sprinkling.

§. 14. And what influence the consideration of *Necessity* had upon the Church, to incline it to admit of *Rhantization* instead of *Immersion*, no doubt the consideration of * *Decency* had the same, it being necessary even by order Apostolical, that in the Church all things should be done εὐσχημόνως, with a *becoming decency*: that no offence might be given either to the *Jews*, or to the *Gentiles*, or to the Church of God; that all occasions of lascivious thoughts might be cut off from those within the Church, and of derision and scoffing from those without it; and a sufficient provision made for the modesty of chaste persons, that were by baptism to be brought into it.

* *Præter verò quatuor istas quas* Thomas *attulit causas; etiam quintam aliqui addunt,* honestatem; *propter quam* decentius *est bodie* adultos *ipsos* adspergere *vel* perfundere, *quàm nudatos toto corpore immergere. Nempe* antiquis temporibus, *quando candida simplicitas magis vigebat,* honestè denudabantur toti: *sed postquam, ut aliorum, ita* Sacerdotum *accrevit nequitia, experientiâ id toti Orbi testante; honestè amplius id fieri non potuit: & hæc propter, jam à quinque retrò sæculis paulatim per universum fere occidentem consuetudo illa exoleviit,* Voss. *de Bapt. Disp.* 1. *Thes.* 9. *p.* 360.

§. 15. It is too notorious to need proof, that in the Primitive times, those that were baptized by *dipping*, were stark naked, when baptized. But if any question were of it, that of S. *Chrysostom* would put it out of doubt, when, in his Epistle to Pope *Innocent*, speaking of the insolencies and outrages committed by *Theophilus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and his party in *Constantinople*, he remonstrates

* how

how a party of Souldiers went on the Sabbath day into the Churches, and with great violence drave out all thence, insomuch that even the women, who at that time had stripped themselves to be baptized, for fear of worse mischief, fled away naked, being not suffered to cover themselves. And as it was then, so it seems it continued still in the Church for many Ages, even down to S. *Bernards* time. Whence saith he, we are born naked into this world, naked also we come to baptism, that naked and without impediment we may arrive at heaven.

Mulieres quoque, quæ per illud tempus se exuerant ut baptizarentur, metu graviorum insidiarum nudæ aufugerunt. Neque enim concedebatur ut se velarent, sicut honestas decet. Multæ etiam acceptis vulneribus ejiciebantur, & sanguine implebantur natatoria, & sancto cruore rubescebant fluenta. D. Chrysost. *Ep. Innocentio.*

Nam ideo nudi nascimur in hoc seculo, nudi etiam accedimus ad baptismum, ut nudi & sine impedimento perveniamus ad cœlum. D. Bernard. *de Mod. ben. vivendi Serm.* 46.

Eundem morem in Latina *obtinuisse Ecclesiæ etiam usque ad* Bernardi *Tempora, (post quæ succrescente tam Sacerdotum, quàm aliorum nequitiâ, scandali & flagitii causa sublatus fuit,) illustria hæc Testimonia ostendant,* Voss. *de Bapt. Disp.* 1. *Thes.* 6. *pag.* 350.

Et sanè quia toti immergebantur: baptismus autem sive immersio non vestium est, sed humani corporis: *ergo etiam posito pudore,* toto penitus corpore *nudabantur, adeò ut ne fasciam quidem obduxisse videantur partibus pudendis: saltem earum apud veteres non est mentio; sed ita loquuntur universi, quasi non minùs nudi baptizarentur, quàm* Adam *fuerit in Paradiso, vel quàm de Matre omnes nascimur; vel quàm petemus cœlos, vel quàm Christus crucifixus fuit.* Voss. *de Bapt. Disp.* 1 *Thes.* 6. *p.* 350.

In divino nostro ortu ad Sacerdotem quidem is adducitur qui spirituali regeneratione donandus est. Ipse autem, & ædes ejus, adhibitâ ministrorum eorum, qui ad hoc constituti sunt, operâ, calc is nudat, & corpus universum detegit.— Per id quòd ille excalceatur & denudatur, prioris vitæ vitiosis affectionibus addictæ denudatio atque ad extremos etiam usque ipsius habitus abjectio significatur. Elias Cretensis *Com. in Greg. Naz. Orat.* 4. *Not.* 24. *p.* 448. Immersio olim *fiebat. Ergo* totus homo *nudus aquam, quæ erat in baptisterio, ingrediebatur, & in ea mergebatur ter, vel semel tantùm, pro diversâ Ecclesiarum consuetudine.— Sed postquam* Copronymus *imperator infans & nudus alimoniæ excremento baptisterium infecit, desierunt homines nudè baptizari.* Lamb. Danæus *Isagog. Christ. l.* 5. *de Sacram. c.* 29. *part.* 4 *pag.* 522. *Mos*

fuit apud veteres, ut qui baptizabantur, nudi baptizarentur, &c. Muſc. *in Pſalm.* 22. *pag.* 259.

§. 16. This being the manner of baptizing, the greateſt care imaginable to prevent indecencies was no more but neceſſary. It being ſcarce poſſible that all, who were either Spectators, or even Actors, in that concern, ſhould ſo far have mortified their fleſhly appetites, but that on occaſion of ſuch objects unbefitting thoughts would, with the violence of an irreſiſtible ſurprize, intrude themſelves into their minds, and ſally out too, in unbecoming looks, if not motions and geſtures alſo of their bodies. And indeed indecencies, and inconveniencies, ariſing from that cuſtom, and requiring the guardance of the ſtricteſt care, were obſerved, and taken notice of. And what care could be taken, was uſed on ſuch occaſions. Hence the Inſtitution of *Deaconeſſes* to attend and aſſiſt at the baptizing of women, to ſtand about and overſhadow them, that nothing of indecency might appear. Hence the baptizing of *Men* by themſelves, *Women* by themſelves, and the *Youths* by themſelves; and that not only in diſtinct companies, but ſometimes in diſtinct baptiſteries, or diſtinct apartments in the ſame baptiſtery. Hence *curtains* drawn about the Fonts, and even between the Baptizer, and the Baptized. And hence the Godfathers holding the Garment of the Baptized before their faces, till he returned to them out of the water.

Idem conſtat ex iis quæ Jo. Moſcus *Pratiſpiritualis cap.* 1. *narrat de* Conone *Presbytero, qui ob* Tentationem *quam patiebatur, non poterat puellam nudam* ſancto oleo *inungere: nam ſi inungebantur nudæ, etiam* baptizabantur *nudæ, quia inunctio baptiſmum conſequebatur.* Voſſ. *de Bapt. Diſ.* 1. *pag.* 353.

Diaconiſſas in baptiſmo ſive miniſterio verbi mulieribus miniſtrare. vid. Magdeb. *cent.* 5. *c.* 7. *col.* 736 *l.* 29. *&c.*

Interea Fœminarum *pudori pleriſque in locis conſulebatur* mulierum *miniſterio, quæ eas ad Baptiſmum veniendo honeſtè nudabant & exuebant, nè quid Baptizantis oculis inverecundè ingereretur; ut S.* Cypr. *Hæreſ.* 89. Voſſ. *de Bapt. Diſp.* 1 *Theſ.* 8. *p.* 354.

Eadem etiam conſuetudo in mulierum *baptiſmo obtinebat, ita tamen*

ut

ut earum pudori non unâ ratione consuli ſerè ſolcat. Voſſ. *de Baptiſmo Diſp.* 1. *Theſ.* 8. *p.* 353. *See Dr.* Cave *Prim. Chriſtian. part.* 1. *c.* 10. *pag.* 312. & 317. *Deinde Presbyteri ingrediuntur in fontem intro in aquam, & baptizantur primò maſculi, deinde fœminæ.* Novarin. *ex Authore Ordinis Romani. lib.* 3. *Schediaſm. Sacropropban. c.* 9 *p.* 81. *Aliâ etiam ratione conſulebatur muliebri verecundiæ; nam viri ſeparatim à fœminis Baptizabantur. Id. ibid. p.* 355. *Interim tribus extructis Baptiſteriis ita ordinavit, ut ipſe ſolos mares pueros in uno baptizaret: alii autem Sacerdotes fœminas ſeorſim, & viros ſeorſim, Act.* Othonis, *l.* 2. *c.* 15. *ap.* Novarin. *ib. Cortinas circa dolia fixis columellis funiliſque inductis oppandi fecit; — ante Sacerdotem verò & commiſtros linteum fune trajecto pependit; quatenus verecundiæ undique proviſum foret, nè quid ineptiæ aut turpitudinis notaretur in ſacramento, &c.* Novarin. *ib.*

§. 17. But all care that could be taken, all courſes that could be deviſed, (even though it were the *baptizing in garments* provided for the purpoſe) proving inſufficient to preſerve this Sacred performance from the profanations of wantonneſs, the Church at laſt on this reaſon, beſides what inducement ſhe had, from what had befallen at the baptizing of *Copronymus*, thought good by degrees to depoſite this way of baptizing by Immerſion, and even to baptize the *healthy* alſo, as well as the *ſickly*, in a way better ſecured from *laſcivious indecencies*, leſs expoſed to ſcoffing railleries, and more agreeable with the humour of female modeſties, even the way of *Sprinkling*.

§. 18. And now let theſe things, to name no more, be diſpaſſionately, and unprejudicately conſidered, and then ſay, whether the Church hath not, upon grounds of higheſt prudence as well as of juſteſt neceſſity, laid aſide the troubleſome, more dangerous, and leſs becoming way of *Immerſion*, and aſſumed the eaſier, the *ſecurer*, and more *decent* way of *Rhantization*.

Quare nè ritum alium ad ſanos, alium ad infirmos, alium ad pueros, alium ad adultos varietur, ſed unus permaneat modus: expedit ut Sacramenti hujus miniſtri tutiorem amplexantes modum, ſuperinfundendo ter baptizent, niſi conſuetudo contrarium habeat. Agend. *Eccleſ. Mogunt. fol.* 23.

CHAP. XVI.

The Institution of Christ not violated by Sprinkling; *and the agreeableness of That, with the primary design of Baptism further manifested.*

§. 1. BUT perhaps it will be said, that for no *necessity*, much less *conveniency* of man, ought there to be any alteration of any *Institution* of *Christs*, much less such a one as is discordant with the design for which it was instituted. And therefore *Immersion* being that way of baptizing which Christ did institute, that way must stand, and *Rhantization* must fall.

§. 2. To this I shall answer by degrees. And first by way of Concession, I say, that supposing *Immersion* to be a *way* of baptizing of *Christs institution*, yet is it but a *way*: it is not *the way*; it is *one* way, not *the only* way, that he did institute. For indeed to speak *properly*, he did institute *baptization*, the thing it self: but neither *immersion*, nor *asperſion*, nor *affusion*, nor any particular *mode*, or way of baptizing, exclusive as to all others. When he tied us to the *thing*, he left us at liberty as to the *manner*, as Dr. *Whitaker*, a man favourable enough to the way of the Anabaptists, doth declare. And what he asserts, I hope, hath been competently vindicated in the foregoing Papers. So that by *asperſion* or *ſprinkling* there is no violation made of, no alteration made in, Christs supposed Institution: unless *Immersion* were the *one particular* way instituted by him, and exclusively to all others, which I think, I have disproved.

§. 3. But Secondly supposing, yet not granting, the highest that can be demanded, or desired, that Christ did *institute dipping* to be the particular way of baptizing; yet is that Institution but a *Ritual* one, of a *Ceremonial Action*, not of a *Moral* Duty. And sure no man will say, but that

Rites

Rites instituted by God *have* given (and then why may they not again give) place to the necessities of man, without his offence; who, so the *Substance* of his Institutions be observed, is not rigorously exacting in the *Circumstantials* thereof, (especially now in the time of the Gospel) provided there be no disdainful *contempt*, nor *wilful neglect* observable in the case.

§. 4. In *Gen.* 17. we find *Circumcision* instituted, and as a Covenant, and that an everlasting one, betwixt God and *Abraham*, and his Seed after him, and that under the severe penalty of excision of the Party, in whom the Covenant was not observed, from off his People. *And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations. This is my Covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy Seed after thee; every man-child among you shall be circumcised*, v. 9, 10. *And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your Generations* — v. 12. *And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his fore-skin is not circumcised, that Soul shall be cut off from his People: he hath broken my Covenant*, v. 14. Here is a Rite strictly instituted, as any can be imagined. And yet this Rite instituted with so much strictness by God, gave way to the necessity, if not conveniency, of Man. For it was not observed for *forty years* together, all the while that the *Israelites* were in the Wilderness, till they were passed over *Jordan*, and come into *Canaan*: and that without any signification of God's pleasure, that they should omit it, or of his displeasure for the omission of it. They were in travel, and surrounded with enemies; they were uncertain in their motions; and continually exposed unto on-sets: and in such case the observation of that Rite could not but be highly inconvenient for them, and thereupon it was for the present laid aside, and not resumed till they had set foot upon, and taken possession of, the promised Land. *Josuah* 5. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

§. 5. In *Levit.* 24. 5. order is given for making of *twelve Cakes*, which were to ſtand before the Lord from Sabbath to Sabbath, and then to be *Aaron's and his Sons*, and to be *eaten by them* in the moſt holy place, and as a thing moſt holy unto the Lord, and to be obſerved by a perpetual Statute. So, here is a poſitive Rite inſtituted, by which the *Shewbread* was to be the Prieſts for ever, and to be eaten by none elſe. Well, *David* in his flight from *Saul* comes hungry with his Men to *Nob*, deſires ſome Bread of *Abimelech* the Prieſt. He tells him he had none under his hand but *hallowed Bread*. *David* then deſires, and takes, and eats of that Bread, which it was neither lawful for him, nor his to eat, but only for the Prieſts, as our Saviour ſaith, *Matth.* 12. 3, 4. And yet neither then, nor after, is any thing charged upon *David* for this; no guilt is laid at his door for ſuch a violation of God's inſtitution. Nay, our Saviour alledges this very example of *David's*, to juſtifie his own Diſciples againſt a charge brought againſt them by the *Phariſees*. Which he had not done, had *David* been criminous in the caſe; and they would not have failed to have replyed upon him for it. A plain caſe that that *Ritual* Inſtitution of God's, did give place to the Neceſſity of *David* and his Men; and that God would rather that ſuch a *Ritual Inſtitution*, though his own, ſhould be unobſerved, than that his Creatures in their neceſſities ſhould be unprovided.

1 *Sam.* 21. 3, 4, 5, 6.

§. 6. The obſervation of the *Sabbath* was moſt ſtrictly injoyned, as moſt holy to the Lord; and whoſoever did any work thereon was ſurely to be put to death: and this obſervation was to be ſucceſſive throughout their Generations for a perpetual Covenant, *Exod.* 21. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. And yet this ſo ſevere an Inſtitution of God's gave place to the neceſſities of Man. The work of the *Sanctuary* (which was laborious enough) not excepted in the Inſtitution, which forbids all manner of work without exception, was to be done on the Sabbath days. The Prieſts there-

therefore ſatisfied in conſcience touching the lawfulneſs of *doing their Office*, though conſiſting in never ſo laborious an employment, on that day, by the neceſſity there was for it, notwithſtanding that ſtrictneſs of the Divine Inſtitution to the contrary, go about their buſineſs, and are neither blamed by GOD, nor Man.

Have ye not read in the Law (ſaith our Saviour) to the *Phariſees*; *how that on the Sabbath days the Prieſts in the Temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameleſs?* What they did, as being contrary to the *Divine Inſtitution*, was a profanation; but as being done upon neceſſity, (becauſe otherwiſe the ſervice of God requiſite on the day could not have been performed) ſo it was free from blame. And this our Saviour urged in juſtification of his Diſciples, accuſed by the *Phariſees* for doing that which was not lawful on the Sabbath day, namely *plucking ears of corn*, and eating of them: in which action, though in it ſelf repugnant to the Divine Inſtitution, yet becauſe done for a ſupply of their preſent neceſſity, he pronounces them guiltleſs, *v.* 7. Yea how often doth he convince them, even by their own practice, of this truth of the *Sabbaths* giving way to the neceſſity, not only of Man, but even of Beaſts, Sheep, Oxen, Aſſes, of which, if any fell in a Ditch on the Sabbath day, they would, for all the divineneſs of the Sabbath's Inſtitution, not fail to pluck it out, and were not blamed therein. Nor indeed could they, as acting therein but according to the will of God, and that plainly declared by his Prophet, (*Hoſea* 6. 7.) though they underſtood not that paſſage in him, and are therefore bidden *to go and learn what it meant*, (Matth. 9. 13.) namely that ſaying of God, *I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice*. Wherein God declares his preferring acts of Mercy, and Charity, before the *Ceremonies* even of his own *Ritual Laws*, and likes the exhibiting of mercy towards them that ſtand in need of it, better than the offering of the

Matth. 12. 5.

Matth. 12. 10. Luke 14. 5.

richeſt Sacrifices to himſelf. Which if they had underſtood, our Saviour argues thence in the behalf of his Diſciples, they would rather have made a fair conſtruction of that action of theirs, in plucking the *ears of corn* to eat for the ſatisfaction of their preſent hunger, which their neceſſity rendered juſtifiable, than under pretence of zeal to the Sabbath, have ſo falſly charged the Innocent. And as a determination of the queſtion for the future in all ſuch caſes of mercy or neceſſity, he tells them (*Mark* 2. 27.) that *the Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath:* intimating thereby, that the Ritual obſervation of that Day was to give place, when the real neceſſity of Man ſtood in competition with it.

§. 7. And now the caſe having been thus under the Laws of God before Chriſt's coming, and the deviation from thoſe Laws on grounds of mercy and neceſſity juſtified by our Saviour when he was come; Can it be thought it is otherwiſe now, under the *Evangelical Oeconomy?* or that he more ſeverely ſtands upon the rigid obſervation of his own *Ritual Inſtitutions*, than he did of his Fathers *Ceremonial Laws?* Did he become a curſe for us, to redeem us from the curſe of the Law, even for non-obſervance of ſuch things, to bring us under a curſe of the Goſpel, for non-obſervance of the like things? The Goſpel has no ſuch curſe in it. And who can think that he, that would have his Sabbath broke, rather than a Beaſt ſhould periſh in a Ditch, would rather have a Soul periſh for want of Baptiſm, than not have it dipped, when baptized? As therefore *the Sabbath was made for Man*, and *not Man for the Sabbath*: ſo may we conclude, that *Baptiſm was made for Man*, and *not Man for Baptiſm*: and that therefore the obſervation of a Rite in the one, ought to give place to the neceſſity of the other: and that Chriſt never intended the deſtruction of the Body, by that which he inſtituted for the Salvation of the Soul.

—Cumque etiam non homo propter Baptiſmum, ſed Baptiſmus propter hominem factus ſit — Keckerman. *Syſtem. Theolog. pag.* 452.

§. 8. And

§. 8. And what may be ſaid in juſtification of an *omiſſion* of a ritual Inſtitution, may be ſaid, and more ſtrongly, in juſtification of an *alteration* in one: provided the grounds be equally fair and juſt; and that there be no contempt, nor contumacy in the caſe, but the equitable plea of a juſt neceſſity: and provided alſo that there be no alteration in the *ſubſtance* of the Inſtitution, but only in ſome *circumſtance* of it: an omiſſion of the whole ſubſtance being a further remove from its obſervation, than a change of it in but ſome Circumſtantial part.

§. 9. And that ſuch changes have been, and been without blame, will appear by inſtances. In *Deut.* 5. expreſs order is given to keep the *Paſſeover* ſtrictly on the *fourteenth day* of the *firſt month*: and that Inſtitution eſtabliſhed by a ſevere menace of exciſion to him that did not exactly obſerve it according to that circumſtance of time preſcribed, *becauſe he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed ſeaſon. v.* 13. And yet notwithſtanding, this ſo ſtrict Inſtitution gave way to neceſſity, and even by the Lords own approbation when conſulted in the caſe, though he had made no proviſion for it before he was conſulted, as ſuppoſing that even the reaſon of man, without conſulting him, was ſufficient to direct and determine it ſelf, as to what was to be done in a caſe of neceſſity. For the man that was unclean by reaſon of a dead body, or was in a journey, and ſo could not keep exact touch with the Ordinance, was excuſed from the exact obſervance of it: yet not ſo as to vary from it in *ſubſtance*, but only in *circumſtance*. The thing they muſt do; no liberty from that: but they might alter the time, and do on the Fourteenth day of the Second month, what was to have been done on the Fourteenth day of the Firſt, *v.* 11. By which inſtance 'tis fairly declared, as if writ with a beam of the Sun, that on juſt neceſſity the moſt ſtrictly commanded Ritual Inſtitution is alterable in *circumſtance*, ſo there be no alteration of it in *ſubſtance*.

§. 10. Touch-

§ 10. Touching this Institution the excellent Author of the *Compassionate Enquiry* hath made an Observation, which I shall beg the favour to borrow from him; namely that the definition of the most minute circumstances of this great Sacrament, and amongst other, that they should eat the Passeover with staves in their hands, shooes on their feet, and their loins girt, is a plain intimation (and accordingly by them understood and practised) that they should eat it in the posture of *standing*, and though it be not ῥητῶς expressed in the Law, that they should so eat it, or in the History that they did so eat it, yet (as Mr. *Pool* in his Synopsis on the place from *Bochartus* tells us) there are several things that perswade to think they did so eat it (and if so they did, then to be sure they did so, either by a positive order, or such bright signification of the divine pleasure in the case as was Tantamount to a Precept.) As first that they were ordered to eat it in all the circumstances of *Travellers* in haste upon a journey, with their loins girded, shooes on their feet, staves in their hands, and expressly to eat it in haste. Now men in that condition do not use to sit, but stand, at their victuals, and have a kind of Proverb, which they use in the case, *viz. Whilst we stand we stay not.* Secondly, *Philo* affirms them to have eaten standing. Nevertheless (saith that forenamed Author) it is well known, that when they were come into the Land of *Canaan* to setled habitations, they ate it *sitting*, or *lying*, according to the usual custom of feasting in those Countries. And this change continued all along till the times of our Saviour, without any reproof from God; and our Saviour himself conforms to them herein, and in the same posture eats the Passeover with his Disciples. Now this (saith he further) is the rather observable, because whenas the posture enjoyned by God was symbolical of the haste

Compass. Enquiry, part. 2. c. 5. pag. 156.

Christus enim & Apostoli non stantes, sed discumbentes, in signum quietis quam habebant, comederunt. Jun. & Pisc. *ap.* Poli *Synopsin in loc.*

haſte in which they went out of *Egypt*, they in the change aforeſaid inſtituted a Ceremony, which was ſymbolical too, but quite of another matter, namely of the *reſt* and *peace* God had now given them in the good Land of *Canaan*. And all this alteration made upon prudential conſiderations, and the reaſon of the thing, without any warrant from God for their direction, or check for the change.

§. 11. Now things being ſo in the Church before our Saviours time, and in his time, what wonder if the Church after his time, upon prudential grounds of neceſſity, decency, expediency, or charity, have followed the former Churches example, and either wholly left off, or in ſome circumſtances varied from, inſtitutions of the ordering of Chriſt himſelf, or his Apoſtles? For where grounds and reaſons of things are the ſame or equal, it cannot be a wonder if actings be the ſame or ſuitable. And thence proceeded the laying down of the *Feaſts of Love*; the Orders of Widows and of Deaconeſſes; thence alſo proceeded the change of the Time and Manner of celebrating the Euchariſt, from Evening and after Supper, unto Morning and *Faſting*; and from lying along on beds, to ſitting, ſtanding or kneeling at the receiving of it; and all this notwithſtanding our Saviours having ſaid at the Inſtitution of it, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, *this do*, which can refer to nothing leſs than the whole performance, ſubſtance, and circumſtances and all. And thence, to be ſhort, proceeded this change of *dipping* in Baptiſm into *Sprinkling*; as alſo that of baptizing *naked* into baptizing *clothed*, which was neceſſary to be, if the Church would have any regard either to *decency* in the Baptiſm,

Euchariſtiæ Sacramentum, & in tempore victûs, & omnibus mandatum à Domino, etiam antelucanis cœtibus, nec niſi de manu Præſidentium ſumimus. Tertul. *de Corona. c.* 3.

—Quum Chriſtus tum Verbi, tum Sacramentorum Author his verbis, Hoc facite, *certam veris Paſtoribus regulam ſacrarum iſtarum actionum præſcripſerit —* Theod. Beza. *Tract. Theolog. Vol.* 3. *ep.* 8. *p.* 211.

Nam quis prudens ſimul ac Eccleſiaſticæ memoriæ peritus dubitet

or

perfundendi ac mergendi corporis morem præcepto significari? Atqui introductio parvulorum baptizandorum more; quin nè introductio quidem more, sed, quod semper factum constat, cùm mortis necessitate parvuli baptizarentur; quis sanus dubitet ita baptizatos, ut sanitatis eorum ratio constaret? Nam & cùm primùm in Ecclesiis baptizatum est, necesse fuit ab immersionis ritu, qui in aquâ profluente, vel stante usurpari poterat, discedi. Idque ratione idoneâ, si verè S. Petrus, *salutis rationem per Baptismum, non in sordium carnis lavacro, sed in sincerâ Christianismi professione positam ostendit. Neque enim ad salutem interest, vel decori in Ecclesiâ, vel sanitatis ac vitæ rationem in administrando Baptismo, nullam haberi.* Herb. Thorndike, de ratione ac jure finiendi Controversias Ecclesiæ, p. 260. *Deinde, cui dubium est Apostolos sacram temporum itemque locorum & personarum rationem in externis ritibus summam habuisse? adeò quidem ut eosdem ritus per omnia ubique custoditos fuisse non sit probabile, sicut ex illâ* Irenæi *ad* Victorem *insigni Epistola satis liquet. Quid quod quædam etiam illorum instituta veluti communes illas ἀνάγκας ipsa necessitas abolevit? Itaque quicquid ab Apostolis factitatum est, quod ad ritus attinet, nec statim sine aliqua exceptione, pro regula sequendum existimo. Nec sanè miror veteres illos habitâ suorum temporum ratione, quædam illis primis detraxisse, quædam adjecisse, quædam denique immutâsse.* Theod. Beza. *Tract. Theolog. Vol.* 3. *ep.* 8. *ad* Edmund Grindal. *Ep. Lond. p.* 210. *Etsi Baptismus propriè significet* immersionem, *& in veteri Ecclesiâ per regiones Orientis non* adspersione, *sed* immersione *Baptismus celebrabatur; tamen in regionibus Christianismi frigidioribus adspersio loco immersionis recepta est, propter infantes; quia* charitas & necessitas dispensant de Ceremoniis, *easque* οἰκονομίᾳ *quadam temperant, quatenus id salvâ ἀναλογίᾳ fieri potest.* Keckerman. *System. Theolog. l.* 3. *c.* 8. *p.* 451. *Non possumus diffiteri primam institutionem Baptismi* immersione, *non verò* adspersione *constitisse, quod disertè patet ex cap.* 6. Rom. *ver.* 3, 4. *Sed quia institutio Baptismi facta est in* regione calidiori, *& quia tunc temporis potissimùm baptizabantur adulti, ideò de hac* Ceremonia *in regionibus* frigidioribus, *& hoc tempore, quo infantes plerunque, rarissimè adulti baptizantur,* potuit Ecclesia dispensare: *præsertim cùm ἀναλογία significationis maneat, & adspersione illâ etiam sordes abluantur; cùmq; etiam non homo propter Baptismum, sed Baptismus propter hominem factus sit, ut* propter necessitatem infantum charitas aliquid in ritu illo poterit mutare. *Præsertim cùm βαπτισμὸς & βάπτισμα sit à verbo βαπτίζω, quod est à βάπτω, βάπτω autem non tantùm* immergo, *sed & aspergo significat. Id. ib. p.* 452. *In baptismo aliud est de Essentia, ut ablutio,*

or to *Charity* towards the Baptized; and that notwithstanding the word in our Saviours precept for baptizing dig signifie to dip, and the way of the *Jews* baptizing in our Saviours time was by *dipping*.

lutio, *juxta illud ad Ephes.* 5. *ubi Apostolus baptismum appellat* Lavacrum *Aquæ: aliud verò accidentarium; nempe ut* Ablutio *hoc vel illo modo fiat*; Dominic. Sot. *Distinct.* 3. *qu. un. Art.* 7.

§. 12. I answer Thirdly, that this supposed alteration in the Institution of Baptism from *Immersion* to *Aspersion*, *Affusion*, or *Pouring* on of water (if we grant it an alteration) is not repugnant to, but well enough comporting with, the *proper* end, and primary *design of baptism*, as a Sacrament.

§. 13. If there be any repugnancy in *aspersion* or *affusion* of water to the *Institution of Baptism*, it is because it represents not the *burial* and *resurrection of Christ*, and that conformity to him in both, which we undertake and vow in baptism: a lively representation whereof is made by *a total immersion* of the baptized into the water, and his *emersion*, after some short stay in it, from under it: without which the *Symbol* is said *to be spoiled, and quite made another thing*. But if that be all, things will do well enough, there will be no cause of quarrel against the Churches way of baptizing. For the *Burial* and *Resurrection* of Christ, and consequently our conformity to him in both, is as well represented by *pouring of water* on the baptized party, as by *putting him into it*. For whilest water is poured upon the body, especially as *it lies along*, it represents a *burial*, especially still as the manner of *burying* is with us. For we do not *dip* the body into the earth, when we bury it, but *pour* earth upon the body; neither was the body of Christ, when buried, immersed into loose earth, but laid in a Sepulchre of stone hewn out of a Rock. And if the *pouring* on of *water* represent a *burial*; then the appearing again after, and from under that *affusion*, especially if of a *larger quantity* of water, (as in some places of *Christendom*,) represents also a *Resurrection*, and still the better, by how much the *affusion* is made of the *larger quantity* of water.

See Sydenhams *Christian Exercitation, chap.* 15. *p.* 139. &c.

And

And the Symbol is not ſpoiled here, nor made any other thing than what it ſhould be. It was to repreſent our conformity with Chriſt in his *burial* and *reſurrection*, and that it doth. And accordingly in the Provincial Council of *Colen*, *Tinction* as well as *Immerſion* (*i. e. Sprinkling* as well as *dipping*) is indifferently ſpoken of as expreſſive of a *Type* of Chriſt's *three days burial*, and our conformity to him in that, and his reſurrection.

Tertiò quoque repetita immerſio vel tinctio typum triduanæ *domini* ſepulturæ *exprimit— per quam Chriſto* conſepulti *ſumus in baptiſmo & cum Chriſto* reſurreximus *in fide, ut à peccatis abluti, in ſanctitate virtutum vivamus, imitando Chriſtum. Can. Concil. Provincial.* Colon. *ſub* Hermanno *celebrati anno* 1536.

§. 14. And if the *Repreſentation* be not altogether ſo *effigiative*, lively and full, as it is in *immerſion*; yet ſo it be done in any reaſonable meaſure, ſo as that by a perſon duly inſtructed in the nature of that Sacrament it may competently be diſcerned and apprehended, it is ſufficient, (and the deſign of no *Sacramental action* we have, that I can think of, is ſelf-evident without inſtruction) that repreſentation being not the primary deſign and principal end of Baptiſm as a Sacrament, but quite another thing. What may that be? Even our *waſhing* and *cleanſing* from the *guilt* of ſin by the ſprinkling of the bloud of Chriſt upon us: which *Beza* ſaith is *Res ipſa Baptiſmi*, the main or only thing of Baptiſm, or the *ſubſtantial part* of it. And Mr. *Atterſol* defining this Sacrament, ſaith, *Baptiſm* is the firſt *Sacrament*, wherein, by the outward

In immerſione expreſſius repræſentatur figura ſepulturæ *Chriſti, ſed in aliis modis baptizandi repræſentatur aliquo modo, licèt non ita expreſſè. Nam quocunque modo fiat ablutio, corpus hominis vel aliqua pars ejus aquæ ſupponitur, ſic ut corpus Chriſti ſub terra fuit poſitum.* Aquin. *Sum.* 3. *q.* 66. *ad* 2. *art.* 7. *Res ipſa baptiſmi eſt* aſperſio ſanguinis *Jeſu Chriſti in remiſſionem omnium peccatorum, & imputationem juſtitiæ ipſius, quæ velut oculis noſtris ſubjiciuntur adhibito externa* aſperſionis *ſigno.* Theod. Bez. *Tract. Theolog. vol.* 1. *de S. Sp. c.* 4. *p.* 28. *Hæc de ſigno baptiſmi*— Res ejus *in genere eſt* ipſe Chriſtus *cum omnibus*

ward washing of the Body with water — the inward cleansing of the Soul by the blood of Christ is represented. *Treat. of Sacr. l. 2. c. 1. p.* 108.

§. 15. Now this may as well be represented by any other way of *ablution*, though it be but that of *Aspersion*, as by *Immersion*. Whence pertinently saith *Peter Martyr* to the purpose. As to what concerns the nature and genuine property of Baptism, that is the *cleansing* from sins. Whence in the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, Christ is said to have cleansed the Church by the *washing of water* with the word: and we are preached to be baptized into the remission of sins. But this cleansing, whether we be *dipped*, or have *water poured*, or *sprinkled* on us, or whatever way we are washed with water, is most appositely shown in Baptism. So he: and to the same purpose speaks our Learned Doctor *Lightfoot*, and *Tilenus* also.

meritis ac beneficiis suis, specialiter verò hîc proponitur nobis remissio peccatorum in ipsius sanguine, sanctificatio in ipsius spiritu, &c. Tilen. *Syntag. De Baptismo, Disp.* 1. *Thes.* 10. *p.* 887.

Verùm quod naturam & germanam Baptismi proprietatem attinget, est emundatio à peccatis. *Unde in Epistola ad* Ephesios *Christus dicitur Ecclesiam* emundâsse lavacro aquæ *in verbo, & prædicamur in remissionem peccatorum baptizari. Hæc autem* repurgatio, *sive* inergamur, *sive* perfundamur, *sive* aspergamur, *aut quocunque modo* aquis abluamur, *in Baptismo appositissimè demonstratur.* Pet. Martyr *in* 1 *Cor.* 10. *fol.* 141. *a.* He had said newly before, and in opposition to which this is added: Scio veteres, *quando per ætatem & valetudinem licuit, usos fuisse* mersione, *quæ in veteri Testamento adumbrata fuit, cùm* Israelitæ mare transmitterent: *non tamen est necessaria, neque* (and mark it) *de illâ præceptum extat. Cùm adhibetur, præclaram habet significationem: quia cùm* merginur, *cum Christo denotamur* mori: *quando* emergimus, *demonstramur cum illo* resurrexisse *ad vitam æternam. Cæterùm significatio ista non est, quemadmodum diximus, necessaria. Id. ib. Ad hanc ablutionem* Sacramentali signo *denotandam satis est* aspersio aquæ, *æque ac in* aquam immersio, *cùm revera* ablutionem *ac purificationem hæc arguat æque ac illa. Dr.* Lightfoot. *Horæ Hebraic. in Matth.* 3. 6. *pag.* 49 — *Cùm nec minus in* aspersione, *quàm in* immersione, Sacramenti analogia *servatur.* Tilen.

len. *Diſp. 1. de Baptiſmo. Theſ.* 15. —*Præſertim cùm ἀναλογία ſignificationis maneat. & adſperſione illâ ſordes abluantur*—Keckerman. *Syſtem. Theol. l.* 3. *c.* 8. *p.* 452.

§. 16. Nay perhaps ſomewhat better may it be repreſented by ſome other way of baptizing than by *Immerſion*. For as the Apoſtle ſaith, (Heb. 9. 22.) *almoſt all things are by the Law purged with blood, and without ſhedding of blood is no remiſſion.* And indeed in the 19*th*. Verſe before, he had ſaid, that *when Moſes had ſpoken* πάσης ἐντολῆς, all, or the whole Commandment, *every Precept*, as we read it, *to all the People according to the Law, he took the blood of Calves, and of Goats, with water, and ſcarlet wool, and hyſſop, and ſprinkled both the book, and all the People*——. *Moreover* (v. 21.) *he ſprinkled with the blood both the Tabernacle, and all the Veſſels of Miniſtry.* (which I humbly conceive was done in order to the purifying them from all *legal pollution*, that might be adherent to them, or attracted by them; and conſecrating them to that purity which becomes the ſervice of God.) And as alluding to this *ſprinkling* of that blood, the blood of Jeſus Chriſt (which is by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf called the *blood of the New Teſtament*, becauſe by this blood the *New Teſtament* was dedicated, as the *old* one was by the *blood of Calves* and *Goats*) is by the Apoſtle called (*Heb.* 12. 24.) αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, *the blood of ſprinkling*. And as having reſpect to our *purgation*, and *ſanctification* by that blood, St. *Peter* (1 Pet. 1. 2.) writes to Believers in Chriſt, under the title of Perſons *Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through ſanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and ſprinkling of the blood of Chriſt: which*, as that beloved boſom Diſciple of Chriſt, St. *John*, tells us, *cleanſeth us from all ſin*, (1 *Joh.* 1. 7.) Whence again he tells us (*Rev.* 1. 5.) of Chriſt's having *loved us, and waſhed us from our ſins in his own Blood.* But now never is the blood of Chriſt, which is ſeveral times

times called the *blood of Sprinkling* (to which expreſſion a fair alluſion is made by *baptiſmal Sprinkling*, and eſpecially being that by that *Sprinkling* of water on our Bodies is peculiarly deſigned a repreſentation of that which is done by the blood of Chriſt to both our Bodies and Souls, even the cleanſing them from all ſin) I ſay, never is the blood of Chriſt called the *blood of dipping*; nor are we ever ſaid to be *dipped into Chriſt's blood*, only to be *waſhed* and *cleanſed* with it.

Cui ritui (ſc. adſperſioni) favet & vox ραντισμὸς, id eſt, adſperſionis, *quæ de Sanguine Chriſti ad peccatorum noſtrorum abolitionem uſurpatur, Heb.* 9. 14. Walæus, *Synopſ. pur. Theolog. Diſp.* 44. *Theſ.* 19. *p.* 606.

§. 17. Now the *primary* deſign of this Sacrament being to ſignifie our waſhing from ſin by vertue of the ſhedding of Chriſt's blood; and our conformity with Chriſt in his *Burial* and *Reſurrection* being but the *ſecondary*; who ſees not how unfitting it is for the *primary* to give way to the *ſecondary*; and that what more directly ſignifies the *primary*, ſhould be omitted, that what ſignifies the *ſecondary*, may be performed: eſpecially when that which ſignifies the primary ſignifies the ſecondary alſo; *ſufficiently*, if not altogether ſo *fully*. And not that only, but ſomething *more* too. For the *pouring* out and *ſprinkling* of the *baptiſmal water* upon us, repreſents not only *God's applying of Chriſt's* blood ſhed to us, for our juſtification, but alſo *Chriſt's ſhedding of* his own blood for us, that thereby we might be juſtified; and beſides that the *effuſion of the Spirit* of grace, and *infuſion of the grace of the Spirit* on us, and into us, for our ſanctification here, in order to our glorification hereafter: which *effuſions* I cannot ſee how they are any way repreſentable by an *immerſion* into water.

Ac ſimul ut ex iis quæ conſummabantur in Chriſto, cognoſceremus, poſt aquæ lavacrum, de cœleſtibus portis ſanctum in nos Spiritum involare, & cœleſtis nos gratiæ unctione perfundi. D. Hilar. *in Matth. can.* 2. *p.* 253.

§. 18. Well then, not only *our washing from sin* by the blood of Christ, the signification of which is the primary design of *Baptism* as a Sacrament, being represented by *affusion*, or *conspersion* of water, but also the *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ, and our conformity to him in both, which is a secondary design of it, it follows that no violation is in this respect done to the Institution of Christ by this alteration of no more but an *accidental* or *circumstantial* Rite in it, whereby *conspersion*, *affusion*, or a *partial mersation* is put for a *total immersion*: the substance of the Sacrament not being varied by a variation of what is but accidental in it.

Applicatio aquæ necessario fuit de essentia Baptismi: at applicatio hoc vel illo modo circumstantiam sonat. Dr. Lightfoot. *Hor. Hebra. in Matth.* 3. 6. p. 50.

Ea quæ sunt per accidens, non variant substantiam rei. Per se autem requiritur corporalis ablutio per aquam: unde & Baptismus lavacrum *nominatur secundum illud Eph.* 5. Mundans eam lavacro aquæ in verbo vitæ. *Sed quòd ablutio fiat hoc vel illo modo, accidit Baptismo. Et ideo talis diversitas non tollit unitatem Baptismi.* Aquin. *Sum.* 3. *q.* 66. *art.* 7. *ad* 1. *Nec ad* lavacrum *necessariò requiritur* immersio *sub aquam.—Christi igitur mandatum est, ut in baptismo fiat purificatio seu ablutio per lavacrum aquæ. Quo verò modo ablutio illa fieri debeat, sive* mergendo, tingendo, perfundendo, *sive* aspergendo, *Christus non præscripsit. Nulla igitur in hac re mutatio fit in* Substantialibus Baptismi. Chemnitii *Exam. Concil. Trid. part.* 2. *pag.* 122. *Pro ipsa quidem Baptismi* Ceremonia *quatenus nobis à Christo tradita est, centies potius ad mortem digladiandum, quàm ut eam nobis eripi sinamus. Sed quum in aquæ symbolo testimonium habemus tam ablutionis nostræ, quàm novæ vitæ: quum in aquâ velut in speculo sanguinem nobis suum Christus repræsentat, ut munditiem inde nostram petamus; quum docet nos spiritu suo refingi, ut mortui peccato justitiæ vivamus, nihil quod ad Baptismi Substantiam faciat, decesse nobis certum est. Quare ab initio liberè sibi permisit Ecclesia, extra hanc substantiam, ritus habere paulum dissimiles. Nam alii* ter, *alii autem* semel *tantùm* mergebant.—Calvin. *in Act. Apost.* 8. 38. p. 244. *At enim, inquiunt, jubemur facere quod fecit Dominus; concedo, sed ita ut in illis quæ facienda præcepit,* primariam *consilii ipsius intentionem, ut loquuntur, ob oculos semper habeamus, formam autem non temere mutemus, (imo ne mutemus quidem ullo modo, si præcisè mandata sit) nec tamen quod per se non est necessarium amplius quàm par sit, urgeamus. Jussit nos Christus baptizari quo verbo certum est significari immersionem. Num igitur malè baptizantur,*

tur, qui aquâ tantùm injectâ aſperguntur? Imò quod eſt in illa actione merè ſubſtantiale (nempe aquæ abiutio) rectè obſervatum eſt ab Eccleſiâ. Immerſio *verò pro* ætatis & regionum *conditione vel retenta eſt, vel in ſimplicem aſperſionem nullâ cum baptiſmi imminutione quodammodo commutata.* Theod. Beza, *Tractat. Theolog. Vol.* 3. *Ep.* 2. *pag.* 195. *Præterea non eſt par ratio, abluendi rationem mutare, ac totum ſimul auferre. Quia in iis qui* aſperguntur, *vel* perfunduntur, *elementum Baptiſmi, nimirum aqua, conſervatur, & ſuam habet ſignificationem.* P. Martyr, *Com. in Rom.* 10. *fol.* 141. *a.—In Baptiſmi adminiſtratione aliæ ſunt aut* Subſtantialia, *aut* Ceremonialia, *aut* Accidentalia. *Subſtantialia ſunt* Aqua, *& illius applicatio, &c. Ceremonialia ſunt reliqua. Ac* Subſtantialia *quidem neque poſſum, neque debent prætermitti, vel immutari. At* Ceremonialia *poſſunt immutari, &c.* Lamb. Danæus *Iſagog. Chriſt. pars* 4. *de Sacramentis, c.* 29. *p.* 521. *Quamvis autem* immerſio *uſitatior olim fuerit, præſertim in* Judæa *& aliis regionibus calidioribus, quàm* aſperſio; *tamen* neque cùm ad baptiſmi ſubſtantiam pertineat hæc circumſtantia; *nec minùs in* aſperſione, *quàm in* immerſione *ſacramenti analogia ſervatur, &c.* Tilen. *Diſp.* 2. *de Baptiſmo Theſ.* 15. *pag.* 886. *Utrum autem ſemel aut ter immergatur, aut ſi aquâ ſuperinfundatur tertiò,* non variat Baptiſmi Eſſentiam. *Agend. Eccleſ. Moguntinenſ. fol.* 23.

§. 19. And if the *Inſtitution* of Chriſt do ſignifie a putting of the whole Party to be baptized under the Water by the Baptizer, (which I apprehend to be the *Anabaptiſts* notion of the word:) and that Inſtitution be violated unleſs that order be exactly obſerved, (and if not, why do they quarrel us?) then the *Anabaptiſts* are guilty of the ſame thing that they charge us withall. For they (in ſtrictneſs of ſpeaking according to this notion of baptizing) never baptize any at all agreeably to the Inſtitution of Chriſt. For as they baptize no Infants at all, which are the moſt capable ſubjects of ſuch baptization: ſo they baptize no Men, no not even the moſt *adult*, ſo. They do not take Men and Women that are all out of the Water, and ſo *immerſe* them wholly into it: but of Perſons that are already in part in the Water, (it may be up to the middle) they *immerſe* the reſt which as yet is not in it. And ſo the work is divided betwixt the *Baptizer* and the *Baptized*: the Baptized firſt *dipping* one half of himſelf, by going ſo deep into the water, and then the *Baptizer* dipping the other half

of him, by *putting* the reſt of him under the water, when he is in. So that their *total immerſion* is no more but a *half baptizing*. For none can properly be ſaid to baptize any more than he puts under water; and that is but one half: unleſs a *Synecdoche* may be allowed in their caſe, as well as ours, by which that which is done to a part, may be ſaid to be done to the whole. And ſo theſe rigid exactors of a *totál immerſion* are found in the iſſue to be but practiſers of a *partial merſation*. And therefore muſt they if we be in fault, even ſhake hands with us; as being in the ſame condemnation, that we are in: though I think, for the action it ſelf, whether their, or our way done, neither of us is to be condemned.

§. 20. But this conſideration being too minute and trifling to dwell upon, I will not thereby be detained from drawing to a Concluſion, in order to the refreſhing of the Reader, who may by this time be ſufficiently tired, with reading ſo thin and dilute a diſcourſe as this is: and that I ſhall briefly diſpatch in a word or two to thoſe Anabaptiſts, who are for a *total dipping* in Baptizing.

CHAP. XVII.

A Concluſion by way of Paræneſis *to the* Dippers.

§. 1. I Will not be ſo diſingenuous, as not to acknowledge, that the *way of Baptizing* which ye are for, hath much to be ſaid for it: as neither diſagreeing with the word of Inſtitution; nor with the * Nature of Baptiſm; nor with the ancient Practice of the Catholick Church, nor with former * Conſtitutions of this particular Church.

* Τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ ᾧ βαπτίζεται τῷ εἰκόνα παρέχει ὥσπερ ἐν ταφῇ τὸ σῶμα παραδεχόμενον. *D.* Baſil. *l. de Sp. S. c.* 15. *p.* 177. *Tom.* 2.

Μίαν καὶ μόνην

Μιμησάμενοι τὴν ταφὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οἱονεὶ γὰρ ἐνθάπτεται τῷ ὕδατι τῶν βαπτιζομένων σώματα. *Id. ib. Nam per* trinam demerſionem & emerſionem *triduana mors Chriſti & reſurrectio repræſentatur.* Nicet. *Com. in Naz. Orat.* 40. *not.* 33. *col.* 1072. *D.* Τὸ δὲ ὁμοίωμα οὕτως ἔχει. ὥσπερ ὁ χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνέστη· οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι θνήσκοντες ἀνιστάμεθα. τὸ γὰρ καταδύσαι τὸ παιδίον ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ τρίτον καὶ ἀναδύσαι, τοῦτο δηλοῖ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν τριήμερον ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. *D.* Athanaſ. *Dict. & Interpret. Parab. S. Script. q.* 94. *p.* 422. *Tom.* 2. *Nos autem quòd* tertiò mergimus, triduanæ ſepulturæ *ſacramenta ſignamus: ut dum* tertiò infans *ab aquis educitur,* reſurrectio *triduani temporis exprimatur, &c.* Greg. 1. *ep.* Leandro, *Tom.* 2. *col.* 609. *See Dr.* Cave, *Prim. Chriſt. part.* 1. *c.* 10. *pag.* 320, 321. ‖ The rites of *Baptiſm* in the Primitive Times were performed in *Rivers* and *Fountains,* where the perſons to be baptized ſtood, and received that Sacrament, *&c. Not.* of *J. G.* on Sir *Tho. Ridleys* View of the Civil Law. *pag.* 176. *Vid. Dr.* Cave, *Prim. Chriſt. part.* 1. *c.* 10. * *Sciant etiam Presbyteri quando ſacrum baptiſma miniſtrant, ut non* effundant aquam *ſuper capita infantium, ſed ſemper* mergantur in lavacro: *ſicut exemplum præbuit per ſemetipſum Dei filius omni credenti, quando eſſet* ter merſus *in undis* Jordanis. *Ita neceſſe eſt ſecundum ordinem ſervari & haberi. Synod. apud* Celechyth. *ſub* Wulfredo *Anno Chr.* 816. *ap.* Spelman. *Concil. Angl. Tom.* 1. *p.* 331. *Vid. B.* Taylor *Caſ. Conſc. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *Rul.* 15, *S.* 6. *p.* 640. *& ib. Sect.* 13. *pag.* 644, 645.

§. 2. And as ſome Learned Perſons, who have defended the Lawfulneſs of *Sprinkling,* have yet in ſome reſpects * preferred *Dipping* before it: ſo though I blame your holding an indiſpenſable Neceſſity of it, contrary to the Rules of Charity and the Practice of the Catholick Church, in ſome juſtly exceptionable Caſes, grounded on Gods own Declaration of his Will to have *Mercy rather than Sacrifice*; yet in order to the Peace of the Church, by your *Re-union* with it, and the ſaving of your Souls, by reſcuing you from under the guilt of Schiſm, I could wiſh the Practice of it retrieved into uſe again, ſo far as

* *Ablutio autem fieri poteſt per aquam, non ſolùm per modum* immerſionis, *ſed etiam per modum* aſperſionis *vel* effuſionis: *& ideo quamvis tutius ſit baptizare per modum* immerſionis *(quia hoc habet communior uſus) poteſt tamen fieri baptiſmus per modum* aſperſionis, *vel etiam per modum* effuſionis, *&c.* Aquin. *Sum.* 3. *q.* 66. *art.* 7. *c. Poteſt igitur utroque*

 poſſibly

utroque modo baptizari, tamen convenientius, & aptius, & securius est baptizare immergendo: possibly might be consistent with *Decency* of baptizing, and safety to the Baptized.

& si satis est de aquâ, totum corpus *debet demergi: si parum, sufficit si sit tantum de aqua, quòd immergi possit pars principalis, &c.* Bonavent. *lib. 4. dist. 3. Art. 2. q. 2. Scias tamen quòd licèt per* aspersionem *vel* effusionem *aquæ possit fieri* baptismus, *ubi esset talis consuetudo; laudabilior tamen est consuetudo, ut fiat per* immersionem. Lynwood. *Constit. l. 3. c. de Baptismo & ejus effectu.* Vas. *illud. in Constit.* Edmundi.

§. 3. But I must also be so just as to say, (and I hope too, that I have made it to appear) that there is much to be said for the way that ye oppose. Ye see it to be repugnant neither to the Word of *Institution*, but lying within the circle of its comprehension; nor yet to the *Nature* of that Sacrament, but eminently expressing the Primary Design of it, and competently the Secondary. Ye see it now practised in most Churches of the world, and may trace its practice through all former Ages of the Church. Ye neither find it contradicted by any *Scripture*, but countenanced by many; nor condemned by any Council, but left uncensured by all. Among all the ancient Catalogues of *Heresies*, ye find not the *Rhantists* (as you are pleased to name us) reckoned for any; nor any Separation made from any Community on account of their being such. Ye find none of the ancient *Fathers* disputing against it for its unlawfulness, nor disswading from it upon account of its insufficiency. Nor of the many baptized by *Sprinkling* in their Sickness, do ye find any, on either of those accounts, baptized by *Dipping* after their recovery. Ye find those learned and judicious Reformers, who threw erroneous Doctrines and Superstitious Practices out of the Church, continuing this Doctrine, and confirming this Practice in it. And ye see it still maintained and defended by Persons of greatest eminency both for Learning and for Judgment in the Reformed Churches. In the Primitive Times the same

same effects were observed to be wrought on Persons baptized in Sickness and in health: so at this day may ye observe Persons baptized by *Sprinkling*, as richly furnished with all spiritual graces as any now, you can tell us of, baptized by *Dipping*: the great God, that is above means, and is not tyed to means, working the like effect by little as by great means; and as fully and effectually communicating the graces of baptism by a *few drops*, as by a *whole ocean*. It is a way of kindness to the weak, of mercy to the sick, and of safety to all. It is a way agreeing with the conditions of all Times, and with the tempers of all seasons. It suits with the Conveniencies of all countries, and with the Necessities of all places. It complies with the State of all Persons, and with the Constitution of all Ages. It provides for the Modesties of the bashful, and prevents unchastities in the Lustful. In a word 'tis the way which most Churches in the world, after many hundred years tryal of *dipping*, have at length in their practice and consequently in their judgments, preferred before it, having generally laid that down, and as generally taken this up.

Non sicut scorpii & serpentes, &c. D. Cyprian. *l.* 4. *ep.* 7.

In Sacramentis salutaribus, necessitate cogente & deo indulgentiam suam largiente, totum credentibus conferunt divina compendia. Id. ib.

§. 4. O why then should you persist in a contrariety to that, which is not contrariant to the word of Institution? Why should you impugn that, which is not repugnant to the nature of the Sacrament? Why should you quarrel that, which agrees with the practice of the Catholick Church? Why should you contradict that, which is not contradicted by any Text of the Sacred Scriptures? Why should you condemn that, which never yet fell under the Censure of any Orthodox Council? Why should that be unlawful with you, whose lawfulness was never

queſtioned by the ancient Fathers? Why ſhould that be a Nullity with you, which was ever a Reality amongſt the Primitive Believers? Why ſhould any on that account be *rebaptized* by you, on which never any was *rebaptized* in any Community of Catholick Profeſſors? Why ſhould that be turned out of the Church by you, which was deliberately continued in it by our pious, learned and judicious Reformers? Why ſhould that be made a Mockery of by you, which hath been ſealed by the communication of the graces of Gods Spirit? Why ſhould the Sentiment of your handful of illegal Conventicles, that can no more pretend to extraordinary Inſpiration than any other Community of Chriſtians, be preferred before the judgment of ſo many legally conſtituted national Churches? Why ſhould you retrench that liberty which hath been eſtated on the Church of Chriſt, by him that was the Lawgiver to it? Why ſhould you deprive weak, ſickly, dying creatures of the benefit of that Mercy, which hath been indulged to them by God the Creator of them? Muſt no conſideration be had of Countries and Places? no reſpect to Times and Seaſons? no regard to Perſons and Conditions? but your Opinion and Practice be made a Rule and a Meaſure univerſally to all, and in ſpite of all, not only inconveniencies, but even incapacities, and neceſſities too? And muſt all the Churches in the world, and all the Chriſtians in the world, that conſent not to, and concurr not with you therein, be unchurched and unchriſtned too for this? Is this cauſe enough for you to ſeparate your ſelves from the acknowledgedly beſt reformed Church upon earth? Conſider, I beſeech you, your ways, with the ſad conſequents of them.

§. 5. O how great is the Guilt you contract upon your ſelves by your running into, and continuing in a *Schiſm*, upon this account: even the guilt of being *carnal* and *ſenſual*, according to (a) St. *Paul*, and St. *Jude*; the guilt of walking contrary

(a) 1 *Cor.* 3. 4. *Jude v.* 19.

trary both to (*b*) Faith and (*c*) charity according to St. *Cyprian*; the guilt of a crime as bad as (*d*) *hereſie*, according to St. *Chryſoſtom*; as ill as (*e*) *Idolatry* and (*f*) *Sacrileдge*, according to *Dionyſius*, *Cyprian*, and *Optatus*; which is (*g*) *Antichriſtianiſm*, and (*h*) *Devil-worſhipping*, according to *Optatus*, *Proſper*, and St. *Ignatius*; a crime *ſo great* (*i*) as ſcarce hath any greater than it ſelf, according to St. *Aug.* not expiable even by (*k*) *Martyrdom* to him that continues in, and hath not repented of, and returned from it, according to St. *Cyprian*.

(b) *Hanc Eccleſiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere ſe fidem credit? D.* Cyprian. *de Unit. Eccleſ.* (c) *Quam verò dilectionem cuſtodit & cogitat, qui diſcordiæ furore veſanus Eccleſiam ſcindit, pacem turbat, charitatem diſſipat? D.* Cypr. *de Unit. Eccleſ.* (d) Τὸ εἰς ἄμετρον ἐμπεσεῖν τὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν χίσαι οὐκ ἐλαττόν ἐστι κακόν. *D.* Chryſ. *in ep. ad Eph. Ed.* Savil. *p.* 823. (e) Οὐκ ἀδοξοτέρα τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ μὴ εἰδωλολατρεῦσαι μνομένης ἡ ἐκείνου τοῦ μὴ χίσαι μαρτυρία, κατ' ἐμὲ ἢ μείζων. Dionyſ. *ap.* Euſeb. *l. 6. c. ult. Pejus hoc crimen eſt quàm quod admiſiſſe lapſi videntur. D.* Cypr. *de Unit. Eccleſ.* (f) *Quod in* Sacrilegos & parricidam *non fecerat, in* Schiſmaticis *fecit.* Optat. *l. 1. p. 25.* (g) *Apparet* Antichriſtos *omnes eſſe quos conſtet à charitate atque ab* unitate Eccleſiæ *receſſiſſe.* Optat. *l. 1. p. 25. Ab Eccleſia ſeparatus, hæreticus eſt, & Antichriſtus.* Proſper. *de Prom. & Præd. implend. c. 5.* (h) Τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει. *D.* Ignat. *ep. ad Smyrn.* (i) *Non eſſe quicquam gravius Sacrilegio Schiſmatis. S.* Aug. *contr. Parmen. l. 2. 2.* (k) *Tales etſi occiſi in confeſſione nominis fuerint, macula iſta nec ſanguine abluitur, inexpiabilis & gravis culpa* diſcordiæ *nec paſſione purgatur. D.* Cyprian. *de Unit. Eccleſ.* See Dr. *Ham.* of Schiſm. *c. 1. ſ. 6.* where theſe, and ſeveral more Sentences out of the Fathers to the ſame purpoſe, are collected.

§. 6. Again, how great is the Miſchief that your *Schiſm* either hath actually attending on it, or hath a natural tendency unto, and which, without the intervention of a divine providence, is likely to be conſequent unto it. You cut your ſelves off from Union with the Church, and from thoſe bleſſed advantages of its prayers and Sacraments;

craments; and from all thoſe ſalvifick influences, which from the Head are by orderly communication derived to all Members in union with it. You out your ſelves of its protection; and all aſſiſtances, that as Members of the ſame Body with it, you might not only in charity expect, but in juſtice claim from it. And you expoſe your ſelves to infinite Temptations to forſake the Truth, and to embrace Error. 'Tis ſeldom known but that thoſe that begin in *Schiſm*, do end in *Hereſie*. And your *Socinian* Brethren might give you a ſad document hereof, if no other did.

§. 7. And 'twere well for the Church that the Miſchief went no further than ſo. But, Gangrene like, the Sore ſpreads. You are impatient of being what you are only amongſt your ſelves: but are reſtleſs to bring in others to your party; and have your Emiſſaries abroad whom you ſend out, by preaching and diſputing to bring in Proſelytes; and ſo involve them in the ſame guilts, deprive them of the ſame advantages, and expoſe them to the ſame Temptations with your ſelves.

§. 8. And yet the Miſchief ſtays not here, but extends it ſelf to a *greater latitude*. Your *Schiſm*, like other Diviſions in Chriſtianity, diſparages the Chriſtian Religion, as a way unable to give any ſolid bottom whereon to fix: ſince the Profeſſors of it are not at unity amongſt themſelves, but ſlit into infinite Diviſions and Parties, ſo that *Turks*, *Jews*, and *Pagans* are ſcandalized at it, and on that account refuſe to embrace it. It diſcredits particularly the *Engliſh Churches Reformation* as inſufficient, and needing to be new reformed: ſo that all turnings from *Popery* are to no purpoſe, without ſtill more turning, even till they come at *Anabaptiſtry*: where yet we ſee there is no ſtay; but a further *turning ſtill*, even from thence to *Quakery*, and thence round to *Popery* again. It weakens the Reformed Intereſt, and expoſes it to be made a Prey to the *Popiſh Faction*, opening another Gap for that Potent

tent and Politick Enemy to break in at: who when he comes, as he will be so *strong*, as to bear down all before him, so he will be so *wise*, as to leave none to stand besides him. And as ye will not stand, if we fall; so will ye not escape, if we be destroyed, but *blaze* in the same fires, that *burn* us. To insist no further on this Head of Discourse, it tends to the ruine of the Kingdom. For *Schisms* in the Church are naturally productive of *Factions* in the State; (as we have, God knows, sufficiently learnt by our too late, and too sad experience hereof!) and *Divisions* at home are invitations to an *Invasion* from abroad; and even court its coming. And God grant that neither we, nor you, may ever live to find this verified in the effect of it. If ever it should, the conquering Sword will know no difference betwixt *Guelph* and *Gibeline*, but harass, ravage, and ruine all.

§. 9. And lastly, O how little, or rather no cause at all have you, by your *Schism* to draw, either on your selves that Guilt, or on your selves and others this Mischief?

§. 10. If it were demonstrable that in this Point we were in an Error; yet sure an Error in a Church so nobly reformed as ours is, in so little a matter, as a small variation in the circumstance of an Institution, and upon Reasons of great prudence, high charity, and urgent necessity, should not be a sufficient ground for you to make a Separation from its Society and Communion, and turn Schismaticks. Would ye consult Mr. *Hildersham*, a Man sometime the *darling of Dissenters* from the Church of *England*, he would teach you, that those Assemblies, that enjoy the Word and Doctrine of Salvation, though they have many corruptions remaining in them, are to be acknowledged the true Churches of God, and such as none of the Faithful may make Separation from. And he would prove what he taught by the Example *Lect.* 35. *on* Joh. 4.

ample of our Saviour himſelf communicating with the *Jews* in the then ſervice of God, notwithſtanding all the corruptions that then were both in the Prieſts, and People, and Worſhip.

§. 11. But much leſs is it ſo, when it is ſo far from being demonſtrable that we are in an Error, that it is rather demonſtrable that we are in the Truth. Poor I, not worthy to be a hewer of Wood, or a drawer of Water for the Sanctuary of my God, with my weak Reaſon and ſcanty Reading, ſhort Memory and few Books, little Health and leſs leiſure, have in theſe Papers made it diſputable at leaſt, whether we be in any Error, or no: if I have not ſolidly prov'd it, that we are in none. Another, probably, that were furniſhed in better meaſure with thoſe things that I want, might put it beyond diſpute. And who now, that were wiſe, would run themſelves upon ſuch a dangerous Rock as *Schiſm* is, in a Point of ſo nice and thin a ſpeculation as this? (but the *mode* of applying the *Baptiſmal water*) and when ſo much may be ſaid on the adverſe ſide, as may on this?

§. 12. But leaſt of all is it ſo, when, be we never ſo much in an Error, you are not obliged to communicate with us in our Error. For however erroneouſly we baptize our own People, you are not tyed up by us to that way of baptizing. Whoe're of you wants baptiſm for himſelf, or for any of his, may have it performed among us by *Dipping*. And I do believe, that never any, who deſired, was denyed to be ſo baptized, by any Miniſter of the Church of *England*.

§. 13. Wherefore, ſince ye were initiated into Chriſtianity among us, and were of us, before ye went out from us, I will ſay to you, as Mr. *Brightman*, a Man ſometime of great eſteem among the Men of your way, ſaid to ſome that forſook the Communion of this Church in

Rev. 3. 20.

in his time, *Redite ad Ecclesiam, quæ vos genuit & alnit, Return to the Church that bred and brought you up:* and do not obstinately continue in that pernicious way of Separation from it. If ye must be separating, let it be from the company of Schismatical Congregations; and joyn your selves to the Society of Catholick Christians. Help to heal the breach you have made in the Church, by returning to Unity with that Society from whose community ye brake off; and strengthen those Hands by your Conjunction, which ye have weakened by your Separation.

§. 14. I shall conclude with a good-wish, to, and for you. God grant you a right understanding in this, and all other concerns of Christianity; and especially in those wherein you dissent from the Church of *England:* that so you may, with full Conviction of Judgment, and a clear Satisfaction of Conscience, Re-unite with it again. To this, I think, all Lovers of Truth, and Peace, will say, *Amen*: and Lord Jesus, say thou *Amen* to it also. *Amen*, and *Amen*.

FINIS.

A Catalogue of Books printed for, and sold by *Robert Pawlet* at the Sign of the *Bible* in *Chancery*-Lane near *Fleetstreet*.

Practical Christianity, or an Account of the Holiness which the Gospel enjoyns; with the Motives to it, and the Remedies it proposes against Temptations, with a Prayer concluding each distinct Head.

Sermons preached by that eminent Divine *Henry Hammond*, Dr. in Divinity, in large Folio, to bind with his other Works.

The Golden Remains of that ever memorable Mr. *John Hales* of *Eaton* Colledg, &c. The second Impression with many Additions not before published.

Episcopacy as established by Law in England, not prejudicial to Regal Power, written by the command of the late King *Charles*, by *Robert Sanderson*, late Lord Bishop of *Lincoln*.

A Collection of Articles, Injunctions, Canons, Orders, Ordinances and Constitutions Ecclesiastical, and other publick Records of the Church of *England*, with a learned Preface: by *Anthony Sparrow* Lord Bishop of *Norwich*.

A Rationale on the Book of *Common-Prayer* of the Church of *England*, with his Caution to his Dioceſs against false Doctrines, by *Anthony Sparrow*, Lord Bishop of *Norwich*.

Whole Duty of Man laid down in a plain familiar way for the use of all, but especially the meanest Reader: Necessary for all Families. With private Devotions on several Occasions.

Gentlemans Calling, written by the Author of the *Whole Duty of Man*.

The Causes of the Decay of Christian Piety; or an impartial Survey of the Ruins of Christian Religion, undermined by unchristian Practice, by the Author of the whole Duty of Man.

A Scholastical History of the Canon of Holy Scripture, or the certain and indubitable Books thereof, as they are received in the Church of *England*, by Dr. *Cosin* Lord Bishop of *Durham*.

An Historical Vindication of the Church of *England*, as it stands separated from the *Roman*, &c. by Sir *Roger Twisden* Baronet.

Mr. *Chillingworth*'s *Reasons against Popery*, perswading his Friend to turn to his Mother the Church of *England*, from the Church of *Rome*.

The

The Book of Homilies appointed to be read in Churches.

Conſtitutions and Canons Eccleſiaſtical.

Divine Breathings, or, a Pious Soul thirſting after Chriſt in an Hundred excellent Meditations.

Hugo Grotius de Rebus Belgicis, or, the Annals and Hiſtory of the Low Country Wars, in Engliſh.

A Treatiſe of Engliſh Particles: ſhewing much of the variety of their ſignifications and uſes in Engliſh, and how to render them into Latin, according to the propriety and elegancy of that Language, with a *Praxis* upon the ſame; by *William Walker*, B. D. School maſter of *Grantham*.

The Royal Grammar, commonly called *Lillies* Grammar explained, opening the meaning of the Rules, with great plainneſs to the underſtanding of Children of the meaneſt capacity; with choice obſervations on the ſame, from the beſt Authors by *William Walker*, B. D. Author of the Treatiſe of Engliſh Particles.

A Catalogue of all the Parliaments or reputed Parliaments from the Year 1640.

A Narrative of ſome paſſages, in, or relating to the long Parliament, by a Perſon of Honour.

Nemeſius, Nature of Man in Engliſh, by *George Withers*, Gent.

Inconveniencies of Toleration.

Toleration intolerable.

A Letter about Comprehenſion.

A Thankſgiving Sermon, preached before the King by *J. Dolbin*, D. D. Dean of *Weſtminſter*.

Biſhop *Brownrigs* Sermons on Gunpowder Treaſon.

A Narrative of the burning of *London*, 1666. with an Account of the Loſſes, and a moſt remarkable parallel betwixt it and *MOSCO* both as to the Plague and Fire.

The Nuns Complaints againſt the Friers, being the Charge given in the Court of *France* by the Nuns of St. *Katharines* near *Provence*, againſt the Father Friers, their Confeſſors; ſhewing their abuſes in their allowance of undecent Books, the Love Letters, and Marriages of the Friers and Nuns. Their Frolicks and Entertainments, &c. ſeveral times printed in *French*, and now faithfully done into *Engliſh*.

Iter Luſitanicum, or, The Portugal Voyage, with what memorable paſſages interven'd at the Shipping and Tranſportation of her Sacred Majeſty, *Katharine*, Queen of *Great Britain* from *Lisbon* to *England*, by Dr. *Samuel Hind*.

A Charge given by the moſt eminent and learned Sir *Francis Bacon*, at a Seſſions for the Verge, declaring the Juriſdiction thereof,

of, and the Offences herein inquirable, as well by the Common-Law, as by ſeveral Statutes.

Mr. *Whites* learned Tractates of the Laws of *England.*

Graphice, or, the Uſe of Pen and Pencil in Deſigning, Drawing and Painting, by Sir *William Sanderſon* Knight.

Pia Deſideria, viz. *Gemitus Animæ Pœnitentis, Vota Animæ Sanctæ, ſuſpira Animæ Amantis.* Hermanno Hugo *Author.*

Collection of Rules and Orders now uſed in *Chancery, &c.*

Petavius's Hiſtory of the World.

Military and Marine Diſcipline, viz. The exerciſe of Horſe and Foot, with Sir *Francis Veers* directions; and a Treatiſe of Invaſion, by Capt. *Tho. Venn*; the fortifying Towns with the ways of defending, and offending the ſame, by the learned Mathematician *Andr. Tacquet*; alſo Sir *Samuel Morelands* Method of delineating all manner of Fortifications; together with the Art of Founding great Ordnance, the making Gunpowder, taking Heights and Diſtances, with the manner of Fire works.

Thalia Redivivæ: The Paſs-Times and Diverſions of a Countrys Muſe, in Choice Poems on ſeveral Occaſions, by *Henry Vaughan*, Siluriſt: With ſome learned Remains of the Eminent *Eugenius Philalethes*: Never made Publick till now.

All ſorts of Law-Books.